Vol. XXXIV. OCTOBER, 1957. No. 4

THE AUSTRALASIAN
Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS

The Official Organ for communications issued by the Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.

Announcements

MSS, queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *From Jan.,* 1957, £1 *per annum in advance.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—*A.C.R.* Staff.
Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.
Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. T. Duffy, Military Camp, Waiouru, N.Z.
Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.
Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, P.P., Kingaroy, Q.
Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. R. Donohoe, Hobart, Tas.
Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn — Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Tumut, N.S.W.
Diocese of Armidale—Very Rev. C. Fisher, Armidale, N.S.W.
Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.
Diocese of Ballarat—Rt. Rev. J. H. Gleeson, St. Arnaud, Vic.
Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Dubbo, N.S.W.
Diocese of Bunbury—V. Rev. C. Cunningham, Dardanup, W.A.
Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.
Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.
Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, St. Mary's, Dunedin, N.Z.
Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. N. Tobin, Leonora, W.A.
Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithdown, N.S.W.
Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Merewether Beach, N.S.W.
Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.
Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. D. G. Tiernan, Rockhampton, Q.
Diocese of Sale—Rt. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, V.
Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, P.P., Wangaratta, V.
Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.
Diocese of Townsville—Rt. Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.
Diocese of Wagga—Rev. J. Byrne, Tocumwal, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—V. Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wollongong—Rev. W. J. Neilson, Thirroul, N.S.W.
Abbacy of New Norcia—Rev. R. Hynes, P.P., Wyalkatchem, W.A.

Editor:
V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The

Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,
Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 281
Oriental Canon Law—Query regarding valid concelebration—Vigilance in reservation of Blessed Sacrament—Biblical Associations—Readmission to seminaries.

THE BACKGROUND AND MEANING OF THE BIBLICAL FLOOD NARRATIVE, I.,
Rev. William Dalton, S.J. 292

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS: A Brief Review,
Rev| William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 304

MORAL THEOLOGY,
Right Rev. Monsignor James Madden, D.D. 313
Chemists and the sale of certain goods—Communion outside Mass during the afternoon—Distractions at Prayer.

CANON LAW .. .. Very Rev. Mgr. George Gallen, D.C.L. 325
Does Belief in divorce invalidate Marriage?—Banns of Marriage—Nature of a newly-created parish.

LITURGY .. .. Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 332
The Tabernacle.

HOMILETICS .. .. .. Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 339
The Highest Ideal of Self-denial and Patience.

NOTES 346
Portraiture or Gross Distortion (Rev. G. H. Duggan, S.M.)—Port-Royal (Very Rev. T. Veech).

BOOK REVIEWS 357
Ecclesiastical Property in Australia and New Zealand (Munday); It Is Paul Who Writes (Cox); Tridentine Seminary Legislation (O'Donohoe); Life in Christ (McGrath); Jesuits-Biographical Essays (*Ed.* Nash); Mission on the Nile (Dempsey); The Inner Search (Van Zeller).

SHORT NOTICES 304, 338

GENERAL INDEX FOR VOL. XXXIV 365

Nihil Obstat:

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur:

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

1a die, Octobris, 1957.

Official Documents

MOTU PROPRIO

The following "Motu proprio" directed to all the Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, and other local Hierarchs of the Oriental Churches, accompanies and promulgates the recently published import- and portion of Oriental Canon Law (558 canons).

PIUS XII POPE

It is quite evident that the sanctity of the clergy, the edification of the faithful and the good state and splendour of the whole church greatly depend on the willing and diligent observance of ecclesiastical and clerical discipline. The Council of Trent, echoing the constant feeling of the whole Church, most clearly asserted this truth in the following words: "There is nothing that instructs others more effectively and constantly to piety and the worship of God than the life and example of those who have dedicated themselves to the service of God. Because they have been withdrawn from the world and set in a higher position of dignity, others look upon them as upon a mirror and take from them what they must imitate. Hence it is only right that clerics called to the lot of the Lord should so order their life and conduct that in dress, gesture, gait, speech and everything else they may show forth nothing but what is grave, moderate and full of religion. They should indeed avoid small faults, which in them would be great. Their actions should draw to them the veneration of all" (Sess. XXII, *de ref.* c.I).

It has happened, however, that, with the lapse of the centuries, the discipline of the clergy in the Oriental Churches, because it was sometimes defective or uncertain, has proved quite unequal to present circumstances.

Clerics, indeed, know that all synods, whether Ecumenical or particular, celebrated anywhere by the Church did not fail to give suitable and opportune rules on the offices and privileges of Bishops and of other clerics, so that their life might be regulated and their conduct held in order or corrected, if ever abuses should creep in.

Those rules were neither complete nor certain; they were not suitably digested into one body of law; consequently they were not sufficiently helpful to clerics in view of directing their life and activity, nor to Bishops in view of governing their flocks. This state of affairs was

keenly felt by all orders of the clergy. They desired to know their duties and charges clearly and surely, for this would conduce to their spiritual advantage, to the tranquility of their conscience and to the common good of the Church.

But, although some synods made some laudable attempts to satisfy the desires of their own community in this matter, the Oriental Churches daily felt more and more the need of a common body of laws —such a corpus as would be complete, definite, up-to-date, and universal. This desirable code would be a complete and certain instrument of discipline and an effective help to sanctity for all, while being, at the same time, a bond of union between all the Oriental Churches. The desire could only be realized through the one supreme and universal authority of the Roman Pontiff. By his apostolic solicitude the enterprise could be efficiently carried through and receive sanction.

With the publication of this "corpus iuris" and its comparison with the Code of Canon Law the great similarity and even equality of canonical legislation for the universal Catholic Church will clearly stand out. The Church, at all times and in all places, while keeping the lawful ways and customs of the various peoples, strives with maternal solicitude to promote provident legislation which will at once give greater life to faith, greater energy to charity, and forge a stronger bond between the faithful and their lawful Pastors and secure greater union of all with the Vicar of Christ, the Roman Pontiff. This bond of union will conduce to the greater glory of Christ the Saviour and to the building-up of His Mystical Body.

We have already provided by Apostolic Letters for the legislation regarding the discipline of the Sacraments (*Crebrae allatae,* Feb. 22, 1949), regarding ecclesiastical tribunals (*Sollicitudinem Nostram,* Jan. 6, 1950), regarding the religious state and temporal goods (*Postquam Apostolicis Litteris,* Feb. 9, 1952). The time has now come, when We should satisfy the numerous requests of Oriental Bishops and of the Sacred Oriental Congregation (very much hampered in its work by the uncertainties of oriental discipline). Hence We are publishing the laws that pertain to the discipline of the clergy.

Accordingly, everything having been attentively and thoughtfully considered, We hereby of Our own proper motion, with certain knowledge, and with the fulness of Apostolic power, order and decree the promulgation of the canons regarding the discipline of the clergy which have been prepared by the Pontifical Commission for the Codification of the laws of the Oriental Churches.

These canons indicate and define for the sacred Pastors the charges and offices to be exercised by them under the supreme and plenary power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff. The same canons exhort and help them to be, by the integrity of their lives, "the salt of the earth and the light of the world," the patterns and salvation of their flocks.

Worthy of special mention is the patriarchal regime which is, as it were, the chief characteristic of ecclesiastical order in the East. The relative canons, following in the footprints of venerable antiquity, lay down the charges, rights, privileges and lawful attributions of the patriarchates.

It should be noted also that some canons covered by these present Apostolic Letters will be found to have been promulgated by previous Apostolic Letters. This was due to necessity. They were adapted to the rubric under which they were inserted, but now they are here given in their own proper place and with their proper and native force. They are here also confirmed.

It seemed good, besides, to add to these canons dealing with oriental rites and the ecclesiastical hierarchy some canons prepared by the same Pontifical Commission concerning the laity and their Associations for their own sanctification and eternal salvation.

Since the canons on the discipline of the religious state have already been promulgated by Us, the whole canonical discipline regarding Persons is hereby finished. The canons, which We, by Apostolic authority, approve, are those which follow:

> The 558 canons are arranged under five general titles. 1) De ritibus orientalibus (1-15); 2) de personis physicis et moralibus (16-37); 3) de clericis in genere (38-158); 4) de clericis in specie (159-526); 5) de laicis (527-558).

And We, by these Apostolic Letters given "motu proprio" promulgate the above canons, and give them the force of law for the faithful of the Oriental Churches, wherever those faithful may be, and although they may be subject to a Prelate of different rite. As soon as these canons, in virtue of these Apostolic Letters, shall come into force, every statute whatsoever, either general or particular or special, even if enacted by Synods specially approved, and also every prescription and custom still existing either general or particular—all such lose their force, so that the discipline regarding Oriental Rites and Persons is ruled only by these present canons. No particular right contrary to them retains its force, unless when and in so far as it is admitted by these canons.

In order that the knowledge of Our will and pleasure may reach all those concerned in good time, We decree and ordain that these Apostolic Letters given "motu proprio" shall begin to receive execution from the twenty-fifth day of the month of March, feast of the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, in the coming year, everything to the contrary notwithstanding, even if worthy of most special mention.

Considering these most momentous times and the evils which are buffeting the Church of Christ everywhere, there bursts from Our heart the exhortation which the Ecumenical Synod of Trent addressed to the sacred Pastors: "It is most desirable that those who receive the episcopal ministry know well what their duty is. It is supremely important that they understand their calling. They are called, indeed, not to look to their own self-interest, not to seek riches and luxury, but to undergo labours and solicitude in promoting the glory of God. It is undoubtedly true that the faithful will be more easily enkindled to religious fervour and innocence, if they see their Prelates thinking not of the things of the world, but of the salvation of souls and the heavenly country above" (Sess. XXV, de ref., c.I).

To other clerics We give this recommendation: "Apart from the Bishop let them not undertake to do anything, for the people of the Lord is entrusted to him, and he has to give account of their souls" (Canones Apostolorum 40). "Let them obey the Bishop when he commands good things, for as he should show the sincere love of charity to his clerics, they, in turn, should show sincere loyalty to the Bishop" (*Synod of Sardica,* A.D. 343, can. 7).

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, the second day of the month of June, in the year 1957, the nineteenth of Our Pontificate.

PIUS XII POPE.

* * * *

SUPREME SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE

Query
regarding valid concelebration

The question has been put to this Supreme Sacred Congregation whether several priests validly concelebrate the sacrifice of the Mass, if only one of them pronounces the words: "This is my body—This is my blood" over the bread and wine, while the others do not pronounce the

words, but with the knowledge and consent of the celebrant, have the intention of making his words and actions their own.

On Wednesday, March 8, 1957.

Their Eminent Lordships, the Cardinals entrusted with the safeguarding of faith and morals, having received the opinion of the Consultors, decreed the following answer:

No: for by the institution of Christ he alone validly celebrates who pronounces the words of consecration.

On Saturday, the 18th of the same month and year, Our Holy Lord Pius XII by divine Providence Pope, in an Audience granted to the Most Eminent and Reverend Lord Cardinal Pro-secretary of the Holy Office, approved this resolution and ordered it to be published.

Given at Rome, from the Palace of the H.O., May 23, 1957.

ARTHUR DE JORIO, *Notary.*

* * * *

SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES

Decree Urbis et Orbis

Our Holy Mother the Church has always exercised the greatest vigilance in regard to the reservation of the Most Holy Eucharist. Her solicitude in this matter has been shown in a variety of forms throughout the ages. Devotion towards the Blessed Sacrament has been constantly growing, and has made the place where the Body of the Lord is reserved a centre of ever flourishing Christian life.

To preclude abuses and secure proper order, some documents, decrees or laws have frequently been issued by competent Authority, determining the place, form and usages of Eucharistic reservation. These regulations are summed up and expressed thus in the Code of Canon Law (canon 1268 § 2). "The Holy Eucharist must be reserved in the most excellent and most noble place in the church and, in consequence, regularly in the High Altar." Again, "The Holy Eucharist must be reserved in an immovable tabernacle set in the middle of the altar (1269 § 1).

Most recently (Sept. 22, 1956) the Holy Father, in his discourse to the participants in the International Congress for pastoral liturgy held at Assisi, called attention to some chief heads of doctrine and practice in this regard. His Holiness lucidly set forth points concerning the real presence of Christ our Lord in the tabernacle, rejected some modern errors, and strongly recommended exercises of piety

towards the Eucharistic Christ in our tabernacles, according to the approved tradition of the Church.

Having those observations of the Supreme Pontiff in view, the S.C.R. by the faculties given to it decrees as follows:

1. The norms laid down by the Code of Canon Law (cann. 1268, 1269) regarding the reservation of the Blessed Eucharist are to be religiously observed. The local Ordinaries should be vigilant in the matter.

2. The tabernacle must be so firmly fixed to the altar as not to be movable. Regularly it should be on the High Altar, unless another arrangement seems more convenient and more in keeping with the veneration and worship of so great a Sacrament. This ordinarily happens in cathedrals and in collegiate and conventual churches, in which choral functions are held. It can happen sometimes in greater sanctuaries, where the veneration of some image or object might obfuscate the supreme worship of latria due to the Blessed Sacrament.

3. On the altar where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved Mass should be habitually celebrated.

4. In churches, where there is only one altar, this cannot be so built that the priest celebrates facing the people; but the tabernacle for reservation of the Blessed Sacrament must be set in the middle, according to the liturgical laws. It must have the form and dimensions worthy of such a Sacrament.

5. The tabernacle must be solidly closed on every side, and so secure as to exclude all danger of profanation.

6. The tabernacle, while the sacred species are reserved, must be covered with a canopy and, according to the ancient tradition of the church, a perpetual light must burn before it.

7. In form the tabernacle should suit the style of the altar and the church; it should not be too different from the tabernacles which have been in use up to now; it should not be reduced to the appearance of a simple box, but in some manner represent the dwelling of God with men; it should not be adorned with unusual symbols or figures which would excite undue wonder in the faithful or be wrongly interpreted by them. Symbols having no relation to the Blessed Eucharist should be excluded.

8. It is severely prohibited to place Eucharistic tabernacles outside the altar: as, for example, in the wall, or at the side, or behind the altar, or in tempiettos or columns separated from the altar.

9. Contrary custom, either with regard to the mode of reserving

the Blessed Sacrament or with regard to the form of the tabernacle, cannot be presumed, unless there is question of custom more than a hundred years old or immemorial (Cf. Can. 62 § 2), as, for instance, in the case of some tabernacles built after the manner of towers or tempiettos. But these forms cannot be produced anew.

Everything to the contrary notwithstanding.

Rome, June 1, 1957.

C. Card. Cicognani, *Prefect.*
+ A. Carinci, Abp. Seleuc., *Secretary.*

* * * *

PONTIFICAL BIBLICAL COMMISSION

Instruction

to their Lordships the local Ordinaries concerning Biblical Associations, Biblical Congresses and gatherings of the same kind.

Our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, happily reigning, issued a memorable Encyclical Letter on Biblical Studies, dated September 30, 1943. In that Encyclical, *Divino afflante Spiritu,* His Holiness mentioned many things conducive to the advancement of Scriptural learning, and, in particular, paternally exhorted the Bishops of the Catholic world to concern themselves very much with the increase and fostering of veneration for Holy Writ amongst the faithful committed to them, striving to bring all as efficaciously as possible to the knowledge and love of the Divine Books. The Bishops should, therefore, help those pious associations founded for the diffusion of editions of the Sacred Scriptures; they should by word and practice commend the daily reading and meditation of Scripture, especially of the Holy Gospels; they should themselves deliver public dissertations or lectures on biblical matters, and see that such are given by other sacred orators well versed in these subjects; lastly they should encourage and support publications that treat of Scripture or expound it, helping the diffusion of such publications among the various classes and ranks of their flocks.

It is, indeed, with great joy that this Pontifical Biblical Commission, whose special function is to direct and foster biblical studies, learns from many sources of the alacrity that the Bishops have shown in carrying out these exhortations of the Supreme Pontiff. The fruits of this zealous renewal of biblical study has, in not a few regions, been really remarkable.

In many places the Ordinaries have been helped very effectively

by those Biblical Associations which have come into being in recent years. These Associations have produced books, and have held public conferences and lectures which are well calculated to promote the knowledge and love of Holy Writ. Excellent fruits have accrued from the celebration of "Biblical Days" destined for all the faithful, and from "Biblical Weeks" in which biblical subjects are treated more profoundly for special audiences.

There is no doubt whatever that these means, if properly employed, greatly further the knowledge and love of Holy Scripture. This end, however, can be attained only when careful and prudent preparation accompanies such efforts. In the first place, the subjects to be treated in the conferences or congresses must be suitably chosen. The most important range of subjects are those which serve to bring out the theological profundities of the Sacred Books and serve to increase the people's veneration for the divine treasures of Holy Scripture. Historical, critical and literary questions also have their place, certain matters being of greater moment because of local interest, discussions or controversies.

The speakers who handle the themes in such Congresses or Conferences should be quite competent in the particular subjects assigned to them. They should be sincerely obedient to the directions given by the Holy See; they should be prudent and sober in their expositions; they should know and keep in mind the scientific and spiritual conditions of their hearers. The results of Congresses carried out in this prudent and thoroughly Catholic way stand out clearly in the many reports which have come to this Biblical Commission.

It is to be regretted, however, that the norms just mentioned are not satisfactorily observed everywhere. Sometimes, indeed, there is danger that those Congresses arranged by Biblical Associations or others do not sufficiently profit all who frequent them, and it even happens that they tend more to the destruction than to the building up of the spiritual edifice (2 Co., 10: 8). It is said that the speakers are not always experts on the matters they handle; that some follow too easily authors who are not highly commended, or inconsiderately and rashly admit and propagate opinions that are doubtful or false. Speakers have been known to recommend books or periodicals of dubious value, or publications not approved by ecclesiastical authority, or even condemned writings. Such ways of acting are harmful, and all the more so, when the audiences are in no way prepared and instructed to examine and judge such questions. Cases have been reported of speakers who

pay little attention to the rules so gravely laid down and reiterated by the reigning Pontiff in the Encyclical *Humani generis*. They boldly set forth opinions rejected and condemned by the Magisterium of the Church. Some have dared to substitute for the literal sense legitimately elaborated under the vigilance of the Church another sense, which they call symbolic or spiritual, on the rash plea that it makes difficulties inherent in the literal sense to disappear altogether. It is evident that such things spoken into the ears of persons very little versed in biblical matters are highly dangerous.

Considering all these facts, this Pontifical Biblical Commission, in pursuance of the office of vigilance and direction committed to it, deems it opportune to give these reminders. Biblical Associations and all biblical conventions or conferences, as well as all books and articles for publication in periodicals or journals are, in their character of religious matters and matters regarding the religious instruction of the faithful, subject to the authority and jurisdiction of the Ordinaries. For the more effective observance of this subjection to authority, the Commission has decided to lay down the following rules.

1. All Biblical Associations, as well as their works and undertakings, are subject to the authority and jurisdiction of the competent Ordinary. The competent Ordinary, if there is question of diocesan Associations or Conventions, is the local Ordinary; if there is question of interdiocesan work, the Ordinary is the one in whose diocese the Moderator of the Association has his seat, or the convention is held.

2. New Biblical Associations or any such unions or gatherings cannot be instituted without the approval of the competent Ordinary, who shall also examine and approve their statutes.

3. The Moderator of the Association or the President of any organized convention shall make a yearly report to the competent Ordinary on the status, members, and acts of the organization.

4. All Conventions or Congresses destined for audiences not professedly addicted to studies of Sacred Scripture, whether the gatherings be "Biblical Weeks" or "Biblical Days," cannot be held without the consent of the competent Ordinary and his approval of the programme of subjects to be dealt with. The Ordinary must be notified in good time about the themes and the speakers who are to handle them. When the Congress is over, the President shall give a brief report to the same Ordinary on the matters treated, the discussions carried on, the conclusions arrived at. He shall send the same report also to the Most

Reverend Secretary of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, enclosing the programme of the Congress and the list of speakers.

The regulations just mentioned under No. 4 do not regard those congresses or conferences which are held for Professors of Sacred Scripture and other specialists of biblical science, with a view to scientific examination and discussion of particular questions. But even in those meetings, let care be taken that everything is done according to the sound and approved principles of Catholic doctrine, and according to the norms given by the Holy See. Outsiders, not belonging to the class of professors or specialists, should not be admitted to such meetings.

6. Those who have the task of preparing or directing a congress, such as that described in No. 4, should be careful that subjects be treated which appeal not to curiosity or to the desire of novelty, but are conducive to the solid instruction of the hearers in faith and morals and in ascetical formation. The subjects should arouse and promote a sincere love of the Sacred Books. The speakers chosen for such purpose, should be persons suitable for this task, such persons as are not only learned but also acquainted with the scientific and spiritual condition of the audience. Let the speakers take care that in treating their themes they do not give prominence to difficulties and doubtful matters; they should rather set forth positively what is clear and well certified. If, in the case of some audiences, difficulties and objections need to be treated, let the question be set forth with balance and probity, and then a solid answer given, duly supported by scientific reasons.

Their Lordships, the Ordinaries, should, by the love which they bear to their flocks, diligently attend to this important matter. If the Ordinary cannot do so personally, let him appoint some priest of his diocese, who is a scriptural expert, adorned with solid theological learning, and gifted with prudence. Such a one would take care of Biblical Associations and kindred scriptural things and at certain determined times, according to the Ordinary's decision, present a report. The same priest would examine the scriptural matter in books or articles published or to be published and report to the Ordinary on anything he considered notable.

If all this is done carefully and accurately, there is every hope that these most useful Biblical Associations or Conventions will bring abundant fruit, in the way of fostering daily more and more the knowledge and love of the Word of God, and will be effective in duly promot-

ing biblical studies for the bringing of souls more easily and securely to eternal salvation.

Our Most Holy Lord Pope Pius XII graciously deigned to approve this Instruction and ordered it to be published.

Rome, Dec. 17, 1955.

ATHANASIUS MILLER, O.S.B., *Secretary.*

* * * *

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE SEMINARIIS ET STUDIORUM UNIVERSITATIBUS

DECRETUM

de ratione quo dimissi e Seminariis denuo admitti possint

Sollemne habet Mater Ecclesia candidatos ad Sacerdotium maxima cura esse explorandos, ut digni habilesque Sacris Ordinibus augeantur, indigni vero ineptique arceantur. Quapropter, ab admittendis in Seminarium alumnis, qui e cuiuscumque Dioecesis Seminario, ipsi sua sponte exierint vel a Superioribus quavis de causa dimissi fuerint, generatim abstineant Episcopi; quodsi, omnibus diligenter perpensis, aliquem censeant admittendum, firmo praescripto can. 1363 § 3, C.J.C., adeant insuper Sacram Congregationem de Seminariis et Studiorum Universitatibus huiusmodi auctoritatem rogaturi, quo uberius de candidati aptitudine constare queat.

Quae omnia Scmus D.N. Pius Div. Prov. Papa XII approbare et confirmare dignatus est atque publici iuris fieri mandavit.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus Sancti Callisti d. 12 Julii, A.D. 1957.

+I Card. PIZZARDO, Ep. Albanen, *Praefectus.*

+C. CONFALONIERI, Archiep. Nicopolitan, *a Secretis.*

W. LEONARD.

The Background and Meaning of the Biblical Flood Narrative

Summary: Context—Directives—Parallel texts—Sumerian—Akkadian—The Epic of Gilgamesh—Other parallels—Literary composition of the Biblical text—Repetitions—Discrepancies—Other differences.

CONTEXT.

After the sublime story, told in the first chapters of Genesis, of the making of man, of his introduction into the garden of God, into a life of friendship, even familiarity with his Maker, and finally of his disobedience and fall from grace, the atmosphere of the narrative grows continuously darker. Men who no longer love God inevitably end by hating one another. Eve must have realized that it was indeed a bitter thing to have sinned against her God when she held in her arms the body of her son Abel, murdered in a fit of disappointed envy by his brother. God's mercy had warned Cain (4:6) before his crime, and even protected him after it (4:15). This was the time of God's forbearance (Rom. 3:26), a forbearance which tolerated even the savage war-song of Lamech with its insolent reference to the seven-fold vengeance God threatened to exact from those who would kill Cain—God might be satisfied with seven-fold vengeance, but for Lamech nothing less than seventy-seven-fold! Meanwhile mankind went on its sinful way. After a genealogy meant to bridge the gap of an indefinite period of human history, we are suddenly faced, in the beginning of ch. 6, with the picture of a very wicked world, where, however, there was one exception: 'But Noah found favour with Yahweh.' (6:8).

It is not for us here to explain the first four mysterious verses of ch. 6. The writer favours the view adopted by de Vaux and other modern commentators that there is question of a popular tradition of the sin of celestial beings with mortals, a tradition cited by the sacred author to illustrate the wickedness that brought on the flood. Whatever the explanation, we have in the mind of the redactor who set this fragment here a sort of 'last straw' in the mounting weight of human wickedness. We reach a crisis in the dealings of God with man: His holiness can tolerate no longer such blatant and universal impiety. The Yahwist tradition, with which the story of the flood begins, paints a picture of extreme depravity: 'When Yahweh saw that the wickedness of man on the earth was great, and that man's every thought and all the inclina-

tion of his heart were only evil, he regretted that he had made man on the earth and was grieved to the heart. Then Yahweh said: 'I will wipe from the earth man whom I have created—man and beast, crawling creature and bird of the air as well—for I regret that I made them.' (6: 5-8).

This then is the setting of the flood, a setting of universal human sin offending the eyes of an all-holy God, and drawing upon itself His awful judgment. Yet Abraham's high concept of Yahweh is here fulfilled: 'Far be it from you to do such a thing as kill the just with the wicked, treating just and wicked alike! For be it from you! Shall not the judge of all the earth judge justly?' (Gen. 18:25). So Noah, because he was just, was saved, and in his posterity the history of mankind continued.

DIRECTIVES.

Pius XII, in the great encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu,* clearly warned the exegete that often the meaning of the Old Testament will be misunderstood by one who does not take the pains to make some study of the ancient East, above all its literary forms and conventions.[1] Again, in the Letter to Cardinal Suhard, written under the Pope's authority, we are reminded that 'the question of the literary forms of the first eleven chapters of Genesis is far more obscure and complex (than that of the Pentateuch in general) . . . The first duty in this matter incumbent on scientific exegesis consists in the careful study of all the problems literary, scientific, historical, cultural and religious connected with these chapters; in the next place is required a close examination of the literary methods of the ancient Oriental peoples, their psychology, their manner of expressing themselves, and even their notion of historical truth; the requisite, in a word, is to assemble without preformed judgments all the material of the palaeontological and historical, epigraphical and literary sciences.'[2]

This work of investigation, of comparison, is particularly necessary if we wish to appreciate at its true value the story of the flood, as it appears in the early chapters of Genesis. It looks a simple tale of a world-wide, all-obliterating cataclysm, with picturesque and curious details (shall we say of an eye-witness?) about the duration of the event, the measurements of the ark, the cleverness of the patriarch and hero Noah. How, in the light of the inspiration of the Bible, are we to take these details? Are we to suppose that we have a divine revela-

[1]Vat. Ed., pp. 20-21.
[2]Trans. from *Catholic Commentary,* p. 75.

tion that the ark was actually three hundred cubits long? What exactly is the aim of the inspired writer in giving us this narrative at all? These and many other questions must remain unanswered, or else very arbitrarily answered, unless we obey the instructions of the Pope.

PARALLEL TEXTS.

We are fortunate in possessing in the ancient literatures of the East quite a considerable number of texts which can throw great light on the Biblical story. Some vast inundation in the region of Mesopotamia had certainly left a strong impression in the tradition of its peoples. Let us consider some of the expressions of this ancient memory.

SUMERIAN.

To the very ancient Sumerian king list, originally composed by a learned scribe of the time of Utu-hegal, king of Uruk about 2000 B.C., was later added an introduction dealing with the time before the flood. Its beginning is concise and dignified: 'When kingship was lowered from heaven, kingship was first in Eridu.' The kingdom of Eridu, situated a little south of Ur and about 200 miles south east of modern Baghdad, was succeeded by four other kingdoms, so that the pre-deluvian introduction ends: 'These are five cities, eight kings ruled them for 241,000 years. Then the flood swept over the earth.' We might note in passing that, in comparison with Sumerian methods, the Bible is very moderate in ascribing a mere nine hundred and sixty-nine years to Methusaleh! The king list then proceeds: 'After the flood swept over the earth and when kingship was lowered again from heaven, kingship was first in Kish.' Altogether twenty-three kings ruled after the flood, and the ancient scholar notes that the total duration of their reigns was 24,510 years, 3 months and three and a half days! As in the Bible, the age of man grows less as he advances from the heroic days of the distant past.[3]

In the passage just cited we see the flood as the decisive dividing line of human existence. In this it is at one with the deluge of the Bible. But is there anything parallel to the descriptive narrative of Genesis in the other ancient literatures of the East? Here again we have some interesting and very useful texts.

Among the most important of these is the Sumerian fragment, found at Nippur, which gives a precious account of a very ancient tradition. At the beginning of the text we find a god promising to save mankind from destruction, and to restore its cities and temples. Follow-

[3]Pritchard: *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, p. 265. For a very useful collection of texts illustrating the Flood, cf. Parrot, *The Flood and Noah's Ark*.

ing a cruel decision of heaven to bring about a flood and wipe out the human race, some of the gods are distressed and unhappy. Next we are introduced to the Sumerian Noah, Ziusudra, who, like Noah, was an obedient and humble man, and on the watch for divine communications. As he stands by a wall, a god speaks to him through it and tells him of the coming catastrophe. After a considerable break in the text, we find ourselves in the middle of the flood:

> All the windstorms, exceedingly powerful, attacked as one,
> At the same time the flood sweeps over the cult centres.
> After, for seven days and seven nights,
> The flood had swept over the land,
> And the huge boat had been tossed about by the windstorms on the great waters,
> Utu came forth, who sheds light on heaven and earth.
> Ziusudra opened a window of the huge boat,
> The hero Utu brought his rays into the giant boat.
> Ziusudra, the king,
> Prostrated himself before Utu,
> The king kills an ox, slaughters a sheep.'

After a further break in the text, Ziusudra ends up by being deified, receiving 'life like a god' and 'breath eternal' and dwelling in paradise, 'the land of Dilmun, the place where the sun rises.'[4] It is worth noting that despite the polytheistic background, Ziusudra is presented as a good and pious man, and on this account, presumably, he is saved.

AKKADIAN.

In the Old Babylonian epic cycle centering around the hero Atrahasis, we find another flood narrative. This version goes back to the first dynasty of Babylon, that of Hammurabi, to the reign of Ammizaduga. The serious gaps in the story are filled in by a later Assyrian version dating from the time of Ashurbanipal, a thousand years later.

Here the reason given for the gods' anger against man is the din he was making:

> The land became wide, the people became numerous,
> The land bellowed like wild oxen.
> The god was disturbed by their uproar,
> Enlil heard their clamour
> And said to the great gods:
> "Oppressive has become the clamour of mankind.
> By their uproar they prevent sleep.

A famine and various plagues were let loose upon the noisy mortals, but apparently did not succeed in bringing them to their senses. Finally a deluge is planned for their destruction. This time it is the god Ea who befriends the hero. Atrahasis, whose name means 'Exceedingly

[4]Pritchard, op. cit., pp. 43-44.

Wise,' is told to build a ship, and receives the following instructions:

> Enter the ship and close the door of the ship.
> Aboard her bring thy grain, thy possessions, thy goods,
> Thy wife, thy family, thy relations, and thy craftsmen.
> Beasts of the field, creatures of the field, as many as eat herbs,
> I will send to thee and they shall guard thy door.

We may note here that the reason given for the gods' design against man was a trivial one, very different from the high morality of the Bible. However, there is a better Biblical parallel in the name given to the ark, 'Preserver of Life,' one in keeping with the later symbolism of Christian Baptism. Again, as in the Bible, the details of the construction of the ark are given in a divine revelation. At least this can be presented from the text, since Atrahasis asks Ea for such instructions. After the request the text breaks off:

> Atrahasis opened his mouth to speak,
> Saying to Ea, his lord:
> 'I have never built a ship...
> Draw a design of it on the ground
> That, seeing the design, I may build the ship.'[5]

THE EPIC OF GILGAMESH.

But the fullest and most detailed account of the flood is given in the epic of Gilgamesh. The central theme of the epic is the hero's quest for immortality. This takes him to Utnapishtim the Faraway, who himself, after the hazards of the flood, has been raised to the assembly of the gods.

This epic, which owes much to Sumerian sources, comes from the library of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh, and is known as well in various very ancient versions. The original date of the Akkadian work itself is a little before the beginning of the second millenium. Fragments of Hittite and Hurrian versions, both of the second millenium, have been discovered.

It is in Tablet XI of the epic that Utnapishtim relates to Gilgamesh the story of the flood, and that with a wealth of detail which even outdoes the comparatively full description of the Bible. In fact the first 200 lines of Tablet XI is given to the account.[6] The scene this time is the town of Shuruppak on the bank of the Euphrates. As in other accounts, it is the friendly god Ea, deity of the waters, who reveals to the hero the destructive plan threatening mankind. His instructions are urgent:

> Tear down thy house, build a ship!
> Give up possessions, seek thou life.
> Despise property and keep thy soul alive!
> Aboard the ship take thou the seed of all living things.

---

[5]Pritchard, op. cit., pp. 104-106.
[6]Pritchard, op. cit., pp. 92-96.

The ship that thou shalt build,
Her dimensions shall be to measure.
Equal shall be her width and her length.

Utnapishtim asks the god what he is to say to the people and elders of the town, who will naturally be amazed at such behaviour. Utnapishtim is to tell them that he intends to go on a journey, but that they have no need to worry: the god will send them prosperity, food in abundance. But the crafty god is playing with the double meaning of words. He promises them husk-greens and wheat, but the two words *kukku* and *kibāti,* can mean equally well 'evil' and 'pain'. This converse between Utnapishtim and his contemporaries reminds us of the relationship between Noah and his fellow countrymen which is suggested by 2 Peter 2:5, where the patriarch is called *kēruka dikaiosunēs,* 'preacher of justice'.

So Utnapishtim sets about building the ark:

Ten dozen cubits the height of each of her walls,
Ten dozen cubits each edge of the square deck.
I laid out the shape of her sides and joined her together.
I provided her with six decks,
Dividing her thus into seven parts.
Her floor plan I divided into nine parts.
I hammered water-plugs into her.
I saw to the punting-poles and laid in supplies.
Six *sar* measures of bitument I poured into the furnace,
Three *sar* of asphalt I also poured inside.

The amount of bitumen and asphalt used was generous, as the *sar* represented 3,600, thus indicating that number of *sūtu* measures. Each *sar* would be the equivalent of 8,000 gallons!

Meanwhile the workers on the ark are royally fed on mutton and beef, and have a variety of drinks to cheer them in their toil, must, red wine, white wine as well. Oil too is not lacking. In general, they feasted 'as on New Year's Day.' Finally the great ship is launched, and all the family and property of the hero are taken aboard: 'All my family and kin I made go aboard the ship, the beasts of the field, the wild creatures of the field, all the craftsmen I made go aboard.'

But soon a dreadful storm gathers:

No one can see his fellow,
Nor can the people be recognized from heaven.
The gods were frightened by the deluge,
And, shrinking back, they ascended to the heaven of Anu.
The gods cowered like dogs
Crouched against the outer wall.

How different this panic among the gods from the majestic, transcendent power of Yahweh in the Biblical story! The storm continues to rage for six days and nights, but on the seventh day it subsides. One recalls here the six days of God's creation and His rest on the seventh day.

The sea grew quiet, the tempest was still, the flood ceased.
I looked at the weather: stillness had set in,
And all of mankind had returned to clay.
The landscape was as level as a flat roof.
I opened the hatch, and light fell upon my face.
Bowing low, I sat and wept,
Tears running down my face...
One day, a second day, Mount Nisir held the ship fast,
Allowing no motion.

For six days the hero waited. On the seventh day, the end of the second week since the flood began, Utnapishtim sent out a dove; it returned. He did the same with a swallow; it also returned, since there was no resting-place for it.

Then I sent forth and set free a raven.
The raven went forth and, seeing that the waters had diminished,
He eats, circles, caws, and turns not round.
Then I let out all to the four winds
And offered a sacrifice...
The gods smelled the savour,
The gods smelled the sweet savour,
The gods crowded like flies around the sacrificer.

The section of the story has obvious resemblances to the account of the Bible. The ship settles on a mountain. Birds are sent out of the ark and with the same purpose; in this incident comparison reveals the greater art of the inspired version. Then, as in the case of Noah, sacrifice is offered. We have the same anthropomorphism of the sweet smell of the sacrifice rising to heaven, but, whereas in the Bible the image is clearly symbolic, the Akkadian version is crudely polytheistic.

Unlike Noah, Utnapishtim has another hazard to face before he can regard himself and his companions as safe, a peculiarly polytheistic one. Enlil, the king of the gods, who had devised the destruction of mankind, comes on the scene:

As soon as Enlil arrived,
And saw the ship, Enlil was wroth,
He was filled with wrath against the Igigi gods:
'Has some living soul escaped?
No man was to survive destruction!'

Ea is revealed as the saviour of Utnapishtim, and he defends his action:

Ea opened his mouth to speak,
Saying to valiant Enlil:
'Thou wisest of gods, thou hero,
How couldst thou unreasoning bring on the deluge?
On the sinner impose his sin,
On the transgressor impose his transgression!
Yet be lenient, lest he be cut off,
Be patient, lest he be dislodged!'

Despite the polytheistic setting, we see at least that man's destruction was connected with his sin, his transgression, a moral element which is, of course, far more strongly stressed in the Biblical story. Finally

Enlil is pacified, and the story ends happily:

> Thereupon Enlil went aboard the ship.
> Holding me by the hand he took me aboard.
> He took my wife aboard and made her kneel by my side.
> Standing between us he touched our foreheads to bless us:
> 'Hitherto Utnapishtim has been but human.
> Henceforth Utnapishtim and his wife shall be like unto us gods.'

We can see through the mythological form of such a story to the truth beyond: the yearning of man to be something more than a man, to enter into the sphere and life of the divine, with some inkling of his supernatural role and destiny. But in the case of Noah we go beyond the realm of vague longings: we enter into a new alliance, the forerunner and type of the fulfilment in Christ, in which man truly enters the kingdom of heaven by becoming a son of God.

That this tradition of the flood remained vivid in the literary history of the ancient East is seen from the account of Berossos, a priest of Marduk at Babylon, who lived towards the end of the third century B.C.; part of this account is preserved for us in an Armenian translation of Eusebius's Chronicles. Substantially the same story is given; only, in this case, the hero is told by his protecting god to bury at the town of Sippar all the writing contained in the history of the past. The moral lesson of the story comes more into prominence. The hero is raised to the standing of the gods precisely because he is a good man, and the others are told to imitate his piety.[7]

OTHER PARALLELS.

We have seen, then, something of the tradition of the flood springing from the land of the Tigris and the Euphrates. Is there anything similar in the traditions of the other great centre of ancient civilization, in the literature of Egypt?

Here we do find elements of a myth in which man sins, is doomed to destruction by a disappointed creator, but is saved from annihilation. The text of the story was found written on the walls of the tombs of Seti I, Ramses II and Ramses III, at Thebes. It dates therefore from the 14th to the 12th centuries, but clearly follows an older original. Re, the king of gods and men, 'who came into being by himself,' perceives that mankind is plotting against him. He summons the other gods. They resolve that mankind should be slain, out there in the desert to which it had taken refuge. It is decided that the goddess Hat-Hor should carry out the decision. The goddess lays about her with a will,

---

[7]Cf. *Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* 1955, pp. 703-707, in an article by G. Lambert, S.J.

and mankind is in danger of being utterly exterminated. Re relents, and decides that he will be able to rule mankind now in its weakened and diminished state. He devises a plan to stop the slaughter. He has seven thousand jars of beer made, he mingles it with red ochre, so that the resultant looks like blood. He lays a trap for Hat-Hor by flooding the place of the massacre with this liquid. The story ends as follows: 'Then this goddess went at dawn, and she found this place flooded. Then her face looked beautiful therein. Then she drank, and it was good in her heart. She came back drunken, without having perceived mankind.'[8]

Another remote parallel is found in the instruction which a ruler of about 2,100 B.C. left for his son and heir Meri-ka-re. Apart from other similarities to Biblical language and thought, there is, at the end of the following citation, a passing reference to mankind's sin and punishment: 'Well directed are men, the cattle of the god. He made heaven and earth according to their desire, and he repelled the water-monster. He made the breath of life for their nostrils. They who have issued from his body are his images. He arises in heaven according to their desire. He made for them plants, animals, fowls and fish to feed them. He slew his enemies and injured even his own children because they thought of making rebellion.'[9]

These and a couple of similar references are the nearest parallels which Egyptian literature presents to the tradition of the flood. It is clear that the resemblance is too remote to warrant any effort to find a relationship.

Of the legends in the various folklores of the world which resemble the Mesopotamian account of the flood, some are manifestly derivative. Among this class are to be numbered the Greek legend of Deucalion, best preserved in Apollodorus, and the Syrian account found in *De Dea Syra,* by Pseudo-Lucian. Other traditions found in India and more distant regions, which bear only a remote and general resemblance to that of Mesopotamia, can best be explained by the occurrence of similar catastrophic floods in other parts of the world, floods which in parallel fashion have left their mark on the memories of the people concerned. There seems no need to have recourse to a common primitive tradition of mankind. Such a hypothesis would only succeed in raising fresh and more formidable problems.

---

[8]Pritchard, op. cit., p. 10.
[9]Pritchard, op. cit., p. 417.

LITERARY COMPOSITION OF THE BIBLICAL TEXT.

From what we have already seen, it should be obvious that there is a literary relationship between the Sumerian and Akkadian accounts of the flood and that given in the Bible. Before we try to define more closely this relationship, let us examine the actual text of the Bible in order to understand more fully its own literary composition.

In the opening chapters of Genesis there are quite clearly two traditions at work, which, with a different background, a different style, and a different theological stress, relate the story of creation.[10] In these chapters the two traditions are set side by side.

Now competent scholars, both Catholic and Protestant, find these two traditions, as well as others, constantly in evidence throughout the Pentateuch. It is the background of their whole approach to the literary problems of these books.[11] When such experts come to Gen. 6:5-9:17, they find two accounts of the flood, not set one after the other as in the case of the creation narratives, but combined together to form a single, loosely woven story. It is the task, then, of the critic, first to separate out the two traditions, and then to appreciate both in the light of their literary style and conventions. Until this has been done the passage is not really understood. Lambert goes so far as to maintain that such a procedure leads to results which can be called certain.[12] It is useless in the fact of the evidence to take refuge in a generalization on the Hebrews' 'predilection for repetition'.[13] Allowing fully for the Hebrew love of parallel forms and its Oriental style of narration, the reader, on analyzing this passage, is forced to the conclusion that there are two distinct traditions woven together.

REPETITIONS.

The following is a brief statement of the evidence.[14] First of all, the repetitions go far beyond the normal Hebrew narrative style. Thus it is twice stated that human wickedness is the cause of the deluge (6.5-7 and 6:11-13). In two different texts God announces His inten-

---

[10]Dass mit 2:4 eine andere Uberlieferung einsetzt, ist leicht zu sehen.' Junker, *Genesis,* p. 14.

[11]Cf. the highly praised *Introduction Générale au Pentateuque,* by R. de Vaux, O.P., in the *Bible de Jérusalem*; also the introduction to the Pirot-Clamer Bible, by A. Clamer. The writer has found great help in two very full and excellent articles by G. Lambert, S.J., in the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* entitled 'Il n'y aura plus jamais de déluge (Genèse IX, 11), 1955, pp. 581-601; pp. 693-724.

[12]Art. cit., p. 581: 'Il est aisé de constater que la séparation des deux récits du déluge, telle qu'elle est ici présentée, conduit à des résultats certains, en ce qui concerne les éléments principaux.'

[13]*Catholic Commentary,* par. 148b.

[14]Cf. Clamer, op. cit., pp. 178-179.

tion of bringing about the deluge (6:13, 17 and 7:4). Noah is twice given the command to enter the ark with his wife, family and goods (6:18-20 and 7:1-3). Their entry into the ark is twice described (7:7 and 7:13). The beginning of the deluge is twice noted (7:10 and 7:11). The continuation and increase of the deluge is mentioned twice (7:17 and 7:18). There are two references to the death of all living things (7:21 and 7:22-23). The subsiding of the waters is given two mentions (8:1 and 8:3) and God's promise not to send another such deluge is repeated (8:21-22 and 9:8-17).

Let the reader take any narrative passage in the Bible, where the unity of author is acknowledged by all, and check its repetitions in comparison with those mentioned above. He will find that there are limits to the Hebrew's predilection for repetitious style.

DISCREPANCIES.

However, in addition to such repetitionss, more recent Catholic commentators, as for example Chaine, de Vaux, Clamer, Alfrink, Lambert, and Vawter, have no hesitation in admitting a considerable number of discrepancies. That these disagreements do not touch in any way the inerrancy of the sacred text will be shown later in this article. In general, such authors are agreed on the following points of opposition. Not all are equally cogent, but their combined effect is quite convincing.

Thus they find two different accounts of the number of animals which enter the ark. In 6:19-20 and 7:15-16, we read that a pair of each kind of animal is to be saved, while in 7:2 the number becomes seven pairs of clean animals and one pair of unclean animals. There are two different accounts of the cause of the deluge: in the first, 7:4, 12; 8:2b, it is caused by the rain; in the second, 7:11; 8:2a, the water breaks forth from the great abyss. When we come to the end of the flood, there is the same lack of harmony: in 8:5 the tops of the mountains begin to appear, while in 8:9 there is no place yet for the dove to alight. Again, Noah becomes aware that the waters have subsided in two quite different ways: first of all by his experiment with the birds (8:6-12) and by his own observation (8:13b), and secondly by revelation from God, who has to give him the command to leave the ark (8:14-16).

It is, however, in the chronology of the deluge that the most striking differences appear. According to one account, the flood lasted one hundred and one days. We are told in 7:4, 12 that the rain lasted

forty days and forty nights, then in 8:3a that the waters gradually receded. After forty days Noah opened the window and released the raven. We can presume from 8:10 that it was after seven days that he sent out the dove for the first time. After another seven days he sent out the dove a second time. Thus we have two periods of forty days in addition to three periods of seven days, which makes a total of one hundred and one days.

But the second account makes the flood last one solar year. In this the fountains of the abyss and the floodgates of heaven pour over and cover the earth for the space of 150 days (7:24; 8:2a, 3b). The deluge subsides completely only in Noah's six hundred and first year, in the first month, on the first day of the month (8:13); it had begun in the six hundreth year of his life, on the seventeenth day of the second month (7:11). Noah still has to wait until the twenty-seventh day of the second month before he leaves the ark. Thus the total length of the deluge comes to one year of Noah's life plus eleven days. We can take it that the author is speaking of a lunar year, with six months of 30 days and six of 29, thus making the total for the year 354 days. In this case the total duration of the flood comes to 365 days, or a solar year.

OTHER DIFFERENCES.

To complete the case for distinguishing two traditions in the flood story, let us briefly consider the differences of style and vocabulary. These are fully in keeping with what we know elsewhere of these two traditions. In the first, God is given the name 'Yahweh': hence, from the German way of writing this name, the commonly accepted terminology of the 'J' tradition. This tradition is lively and human in its style. God repents and is grieved to the heart (6:6), He closes the door on Noah (7:16), He smells the sweet savour of sacrifice (8:21). However, whenever God is given the name 'Elohim', we find no such anthropomorphisms. Instead of the lively, picturesque style of 'J', we have the heavy, symmetrical style we associate with the beginning of Genesis, with its numbers and repetitions and stereotyped formulas. One such formula, endlessly repeated in 6:20 and 7:14, 'according to its kind,' is found used in the same mechanical fashion in the creation narrative. To this second tradition scholars give the letter 'P' as an abbreviation for 'priestly' tradition.

Other differences in vocabulary may be noted. The sex of the animals is given in two different ways: in 7:2...the literal translation

is 'man and woman', while in 6:19 the expression is 'male and female'. We have also two ways of expressing the same reality in the phrases 'all living things' (7:4, 23), and 'all flesh' (6:12, 13, 17; 7:16a, 21).

W. J. DALTON, S.J.

(To be continued)

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

MORE APOSTLES AND EVANGELISTS (The Vine Series II).
MARTYRS IN THE CANON (The Vine Series III).

Both books by Teresa Lloyd, in uniform edition of 80 pp. 3/6 (A), published in 1955 by Herder Publications, London.

Both books have a value far out-weighing their modest price. We have no hesitation in recommending them to all Catholic teachers, parents and to anyone desirous of more information in the subjects treated. Although legend and fiction are avoided there is by no means a lack of imagination in the writing; and we are of the opinion that, in the hands of a competent reader, these books will present the saints as lovable and heroic figures calling persausively to us from the heights.

The first book gives us St. John the Baptist, St. Stephen, Saints Paul, Barnabas, Mark and Luke. A clear map shows the journeys of St. Paul and the Evangelists. An example, taken at random, shows documentary truth set off by imagination. The writer is describing the imprisonment of St. John the Baptist: "Though St. John was so brave and holy he must have found it hard to be shut up in a dark dungeon. It must have been specially hard for him who had been used to the clean, fresh air of the desert, though imprisonment is hard for any one." In each chapter there are abundant quotations from the Gospels or from St. Paul's Epistles. Thus will children or grown-ups be led "to read the New Testament in an increasing spirit of humble prayer." This is the expressed hope of the writer.

In the second book there is a clear map of the Roman Empire as it was in the first years of Christianity. It seems to us important that from their early years at school children should be accustomed to see the Martyrs in the Canon as historical figures fighting God's cause against enemies. by no means legendary. Such early realisation establishes a climate of thought which is most necessary for Christian youth and adults if they are ever to grasp more and more clearly the implication sof the Incarnation: Christ the *World-made-Flesh*. stepped into our midst at a certain point in history. And people believed in Him and loved Him so deeply that they died rather than deny Him. These are the thoughts that come to us as we read this little book.

M.O.

The Dead Sea Scrolls

A BRIEF REVIEW.

It is only a little over ten years since a boy of the semi-bedouin tribe of the Ta'amireh, who normally circulate between Bethlehem and the Dead Sea, opened a new door into the so-called "inter-testamental" period of Jewish history. Search for a lost goat led Mohammed adh-Dhib (Wolf) to investigate the inside of a cave on the northern slope of the Wady Qumran, to the north-west of the Dead Sea, some eight miles south of Jericho. He found a number of jars, some empty, some containing manuscript rolls, some broken into fragments. This was in the late spring or early summer of 1947.[1]

The history of progressive discovery in that region during the ten years has come to include not one but many Qumran Caves, the ruins of a Jewish "Monastery" at Kirbet Qumran (nearly a mile to the south), more Caves in Wady Murabba'at (some twelve miles south of Qumran), and a site called Khirbet Mird (Ruins of the Monastery of Castellion), some two miles east-north-east of Mar Saba, on the northern edge of Wady En-Nar, which is the Brook of Kedron on its way to the Dead Sea. A rapid chronicle of the searches and finds will not be unwelcome.

The original cave, which is called Cave I, yielded seven large scrolls which came, through the hands of the Arab tribesmen, into the possession of a dealer in Bethlehem. As the dealer thought that the writing was Syriac, the scrolls were first offered to the Syrian Jacobite Metropolitan residing at St. Mark's Monastery in Old Jerusalem. Some time in July of that year, 1947, he bought four of them. About the end of the year Professor Sukenik, the leading archaeologist of the Hebrew University, bought two of the jars and three scrolls from the antiquities dealer at Bethlehem.[2]

---

[1]The story of the discoveries is told with admirable vividness by Edmund Wilson (*The Scrolls from the Dead Sea,* now reprinted as a Collins' *Fontana* Book), and by John M. Allegro (*The Dead Sea Scrolls,* a *Pelican* book of 1956). Both these authors, one a journalist, the other a member of the team of scholars entrusted with the publication of the Scrolls, give very full details on the persons, places and events concerned; but both, unfortunately, show lamentable incompetence in assessing the doctrine of the Scrolls and its significance in relation to Christianity. The three best general books up to date are: Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls,* Viking Press, N.Y., 1955; Géza Vermès, *Discovery in the Judean Desert,* Desclée, 1956; and Roland Murphy, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible,* Newman Press, 1957. The latter two writers are respectively a Hungarian Father of Sion and an American Carmelite.

[2]All seven Scrolls are now possessed by the State of Israel and are to be housed in a new building called Hekal hassefer or Shrine of the Book.

Meanwhile the situation between Jews and Arabs was getting worse and worse, and communications between Old and New Jerusalem were more difficult. The Syrian Archbishop, wishing to know the value of his manuscripts, had recourse to the American School of Oriental Research in the Jordan outskirts of Jerusalem.

During the month of February, 1948, the Metropolitan approached the American Institution. The Annual Director, Professor Millar Burrows, of Yale University, was absent. His assistant, Dr. John Trever, examined the chief scroll, which turned out to be a copy of Isaias almost complete. Trever was an excellent photographer, and, with the permission of the Metropolitan, he photographed the whole Scroll of Isaias. As the situation was worsening from day to day, he advised the transfer of the manuscripts to a foreign country, and the Metropolitan did subsequently take his treasure to America, to be publised there (as he stipulated) within three years.

The position of the Cave was not disclosed, but reports about it had got out, and Major Philippe Lippens, a Belgian military observer for United Nations at Amann, accompanied by members of Glubb's Arab Legion, rediscovered the Cave at the end of January, 1949.

In the meantime, the British Mandate had expired on May 14, 1948, and the Jews immediately had proclaimed the new State of Israel. The Arab war kept the Hebrew University out of the exploration of the Caves in the Desert of Judaea. So it happend that the quest for manuscripts fell into the hands of Christian scholars.

When Major Lippens and his party had found Cave I, the Director of Antiquities in Jordan was immediately advised by telephone, and that very sympathetic Englishman, Gerald Lankester Harding, arrived in utmost haste at the spot. He decided to have a proper archaeological excavation of the Cave made as soon as possible.

He found the man most capable of leading such an expedition in the genial Director of the Ecole Biblique et Archéologique Francaise, Father Roland de Vaux, O.P. Between February 8 and March 5 the Cave, which had unfortunately been visited several times during 1948 by clandestine diggers, was subjected to a thorough scientific excavation. The result was some 600 fragments of 75 biblical and non-biblical books—fragments of Leviticus being written in the old Phoenician script—also a good many pieces of pottery, some lamps, and parts of the linens which had wrapped the manuscripts. The pottery, lamps and linen were to serve a purpose in dating the deposit held by the Cave.

Khirbet Qumran—the ruins nearly a mile away from the Scrolls' Cave (Khirbet being the Arabic for "ruin") was the object of the next archaeological campaign, which lasted from November 24 to December 12, 1951. The excavations revealed a building, which was certainly not a private habitation. It was obviously the centre of a numerous community who met there for common exercises and meals in common. Their cemetery nearby revealed that they were not few. The table of the monastery's scriptorium was recognized and reconstructed and even ink wells were found. The number of water cisterns or pools showed that the community attached great importance to ablutions. Moreover, pottery and a model-alphabet for young scribes clearly pointed to a close connection between the "monastery"—for monastery in some sense it was—and the deposits in the Cave.

The pottery—mostly late hellenistic—and the coins that were discovered proved that the "monastery" was occupied from some time before 100 B.C. and abandoned during the years between 31 (the year of an earthquake mentioned by Josephus) and the death of Herod the Great in 4 B.C. It was then rebuilt and reoccupied up to about 68 A.D., shortly before the seige and destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. A third occupation was evidenced for the years of the revolt of Bar Kochba (132-135). The obvious date for the deposit of the manuscript jars in the Cave would be the exodus of the community in 68 A.D.

The Bedouin knew well by this time that there was money in the hunt for scrolls. New fragments, allegedly from Cave I, were brought to Father de Vaux, but he artfully extracted from the Bedouin the true source of their new finds. It was Murabba'at; and four caves were excavated there in the spring of 1952. These finds had no connection with the Qumran community. In the caves, which showed signs of occupation from chalcolithic times, the chief discoveries were apparently remnants of a Bar Kochba deposit. They included biblical fragments and two letters with the signature of Simon ben Kosebah himself (the name being written thus). One non-biblical Hebrew document on papyrus seems to be as old as the Lachish letters or even older (sixth or seventh century B.C.); but some late Greek, Latin and Arabic pieces were found as well.

March, 1952, was marked by a thorough investigation of the Qumran area. In a five-mile radius about forty caves were visited.

Those which were subsequently numbered II and III yielded fragments of O.T. books, and III was remarkable for the two copper inventory scrolls, which, later, were skilfully sliced at Manchester and deciphered by John Allegro.

In September of that same year, 1952, the second greatest—if not the greatest—discovery was made. A Cave IV, a short distance away to the south-west, gave up fragments, representing between 300 and 400 distinct works. A Hebrew and an Aramaic Tobias are said to be amongst them, and fragments have been found of nearly all the books of the Old Testament—none of Esther, it is said.

A Belgian Mission of Major Lippens and Professor de Langhe of Louvain early in 1953 to Khirbet Mird, ruins of the Byzantine monastery of Castellion on the site of ancient Hyrcania (the fortress of John Hyrcanus) brought back mostly Greek New Testament fragments, together with some Syro-Palestinian and Arabic texts.

The fifth spring campaign at Qumran in 1956 is regarded as more or less final; but in the course of 1956 Bedouin again took the spoils of another Cave XI, which were duly handed over to the Department of Antiquities.

It is on this innumerable heap of Scrolls that the specialists of the Scrollery in the Rockefeller Museum at Jerusalem have been and still are working. They are an international band of scholars: Fathers Ronald De Vaux and Father John Starcky from France, the Polish Father Joseph Milik, Monsignor Patrick Skehan and Mr. Frank Cross from America, Professors Allegro and Strugnell from Manchester and Oxford, and the German Professor Claus Hunzinger from Goettingen.

Since the news of the great discoveries in the Judean Wilderness got abroad in April, 1948, a Battle of the Scrolls has been fought on many fronts. The first front was the time-front. As far as I know, the only distinguished scholar, who has stubbornly regarded the whole thing as a hoax, is Dr. Solomon Zeitlin, Professor of Rabbinical Literature at Dropsie College, Philadelphia. To hold such an opinion is indeed going in the face of all evidence. But there have been other savants who have given their verdict against a very early dating of the documents from Qumran. It will be sufficient to mention the names of two prominent semitologists who were of this opinion. Godfrey Rolles Driver, Professor of Semitic Philology at Oxford, in a lecture delivered in October, 1950, adduced evidence which (he thought) suggests some period between the Mishnah and the Talmud, that is,

some time between 200 and 500 A.D. Dr. P. Kahle, the greatest expert on Masoretic studies, was unwilling to date the MSS from Qumran earlier than the second century of the Christian era.

A controversy, mainly in the archaeological field, concerning the date the MSS were deposited in the cave, has subsided into a more or less tacit acceptance of 68 A.D. Nuclear experiment, by means of the Carbon 14 test, was able to attest that the flax from which the linen wrappings were made grew somewhere in the Middle East some time before or after 33 A.D., with a wide margin on either side. The coins found in the monastery would indicate that the community abandoned it, when the Tenth Legion of Titus reached those parts. It is then, most probably, that the cache was made.

But the date of concealment is not the same as the date of the manuscripts themselves. Palaeography (including such graphological points as the use of matres lectionis and the final letters) had its contribution to make to the solution of the relative question as to when the leather rolls were written. Those who, like Albright, had been versed in Hebrew palaeography, and especially the Jewish scholar Solomon Birnbaum, who is the greatest living authority on Hebrew scripts, reached a fair consensus on the matter. The bulk of the manuscripts would have been copied between 150 B.C. and 50 A.D. Some fragments are older and very considerably older, although this may not hold for the Leviticus fragments in Phoenician script. This older type of writing might have been kept as a special honour for the great Ritual Book, as it was kept for the numismatic inscriptions of the Machabees and Bar Kochba.

A general consensus has also been reached on the identification of the community who owned the manuscripts. They belonged to the sect of the Essenes, whom a text of Pliny shows us settled in great numbers on the west shore of the Dead Sea, and whose way of life is described by the two Jewish writers Flavius Josephus and Philo. We now know much more about them, for a good deal of the special literature of the community is included in the recent finds, notably, a Manual of Discipline, some Scriptural Commentaries (especially the extensive midrash or pesher on Habacuc), a sort of apocalyptic war-manual which has been entitled "The War of the Children of Light against the Children of Darkness," and a series of *hodiyoth* or hymns which mostly begin, like many biblical psalms, with the words: "I praise thee (or thank) thee: *"'Odĕkha adonay."* The Hebrew texts of these chief documents

and of the great copy of Isaias (Dead Sea Isaiah a) have been published."[3]

This brief review does not allow much detail about the Battle of the Scrolls on the doctrinal front and their relation to Christianity. One of the most brilliant writers on the scrolls, the French Orientalist Dupont-Sommer gave an unfortunate lead in prejudicially—that is the word—declaring that the Scrolls would probably bring a "cascade of revolutions" in our conceptions of the origin of Christianity. In 1951, at Jerusalem, I read his first book *Apercus préliminaries sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte,* then recently published, and remember well how disgusted I was with it. It is a brilliant book, but as someone said, the author read his own ideas (prompted by infidelity) into the lacunae of his manuscript of the Sectarian Manual and Habacuc commentary. This book of 1950 and its sequel *Nouveaux Apercus* (1953) have had wide diffusion. The first was translated into English by Miss Margaret Rowley (1952), and the second by a British Museum scholar, R. D. Barnett. Both, especially the first, should be read—if read at all—with great caution. Unfortunately Dupont-Sommer, whose oriental learning is certainly great, has become, in the guise of an "alter Renan" (Dupont-Sommer is an ex-Sulpician and, as he says himself, "un pur

---

[3]The first partial publication of texts is due to the late Professor Sukenik (ob. 1953), whose title, *Meghilloth genuzoth,* expressed his opinion that the caves were a *genizah* or repository for discarded manuscripts, which manuscripts on account of their sacredness could not be destroyed. The first part of his *Meghilloth* was published in 1948, and the second in 1950. Since his death the work has been continued by his son Yigael Yadin and others of the Hebrew University.

Apart from what has seen the light in periodicals, the following editions are now available: I. *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary.*. Edd. M. Burrows, J. C. Trever and W. H. Brownlee, New Haven, 1950. II. Fasc. 2 *Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline.* Ibid. 1951. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the University of Jerusalem: War-Scroll with introduction, transcription, plates.* Magnes Press, Jerusalem, 1955. Two completely Hebrew Manual Editions *of War-Scroll* by Yigael Yadin, and of *Thanksgiving Scroll* by Jacob Licht have been published by the Bialik Institute, Jerusalem, 1955, 1957. Some columns of a Genesis Apoeryphon which had been erroneously called Book of Lamech were published in large format by Nachman Avigad and Yigael Yadin in 1956. The fragments from the First Cave have been given to the public in a magnificent volume from the Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1955 (Edd. D. Barthelemy, O.P., and J. T. Milik, with contributions from R. de Vaux, O.P., [Mrs.] G. M. Crowfoot, H. J. Plenderleith, G. L. Harding). The *Damascus-Document* or *Zadoqite Fragments,* which have close affinity with the *Manual of Discipline* had been discovered in a Qaraite Genizah in Cairo in 1896. Editions appeared first at Cambridge, 1910 (ed. Solomon Schechter), at Berlin, 1933 (ed. L. Rost, *Kleine Texte*), at Philadelphia, 1952 (ed. Solomon Zeitlin). The most recent and best edition is that of Chaim Rabin: *The Zadokite Documents,* With Translation and Notes. Oxford, 1954.

savant"), a hero of scientific detachment in the eyes of Edmund Wilson and has also greatly influenced John Allego.

These things are mentioned, because it is a chief purpose of these lines to steer readers of the *A.C.R.* to the best books on the Scrolls.

Brownlee's large volume is very good—the work of a soberly scientific presbyterian scholar. The book contains an account of the discoveries, and a section on the age of the Manuscripts. The dates of composition are treated at considerable length (87 pages) with reference to the apparently historical allusions of the Habacuc Commentary. A chapter on the Qumran Community follows, and a fifth part on the importance of the Scrolls in regard to textual criticism of the O.T., historical grammar and paleography, as also in regard to their contribution to the study of Judaism and Christianity. The last sentence of the final summary will show how balanced the writer is:

"The enlarged understanding of Judaism (furnished by the Scrolls) contributes in turn to our understanding of the New Testament in relation to its background and derivation, and, all the more so because the beliefs, ideals, organization and rites of the covenanters, as compared with those of the early church, exhibit both impressive similarities and even more significant contrasts" (p. 345).

The last seventy pages of the book contain translations of the chief sectarian documents: The Damascus Document, the Habacuc Commentary, the Manual of Discipline, Selections from the *War,* and Selections from the Thanksgiving Psalms.[4]

The extravagant statements made with regard to Qumranism being a sort of proto-christianity will be found answered in a little book of Father Graystone, S.M.: *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Originality of Christ* (S & W, London, 1956).

Half of the excellent little volume of Father Ronald Murphy is devoted to a discussion of the same subject: chapter 3: "The New Testament in the Light of the Scrolls and Fragments." Father Murphy is head of the Semitic Languages Department at Washington.

It would seem that up to date the best book of all, from many points of view, is that of Father Géza Vermès. The author is a Hungarian member of the Congregation of Notre Dame de Sion. As a newly ordained priest, he was studying at Louvain when the noise of the Scrolls

[4]A vigorous and very readable translation of all these documents and more will be found in a cheap volume: *Dead Sea Scriptures* (!) by the Jewish scholar Theodor Caster (A Doubleday Anchor Book. A92. 1957). Some slight reserve must be made in regard to the author's Introductions and Notes.

went forth. I understand that he did his doctoral thesis at the University Theological Faculty on the Scrolls and also specialized in Oriental Languages. From then his superiors have left him at orientalism and he gives himself to the study of Hebrew and Jewish lore, to which he is entirely devoted, both as a collaborator of the Cahiers Sioniens, the scholarly periodical of the Congregation of Sion, and as a scientific research-worker on old Hebrew Commentaries on the Book of Genesis.

The Scroll Literature during those ten years has grown into a huge forest—there must be close on 1000 numbers, books and articles, dated up to 1956, when the English translation of Father Vermès' book appeared. He seems to walk at ease in the forest. Into 120 pages, with abundant footnotes but easily readable text, he puts an enormous amount of learning. Translations of the Documents fill 80 pages. There are some 20 pages of useful supplementary notes and a selected bibliography from which nothing of importance seems to be omitted.

The only criticism we have to offer is that occasionally a certain juvenility marks statements with a slight mark of inaccuracy or exaggeration. The translation is not always quite English.[5]

W. LEONARD.

[5]Father Vermès says nothing about the text-critical light which the fragments now being assembled at Jerusalem are already throwing on the books of the Old Testament. The matter has been omitted in the above notes also, as well as many other things, like the Apocryphon of Genesis, which belong to the vast story of the Discovery in the Judean Desert. That story cannot be satisfactorily written till all the documents are published; and that will take years. Finally, I have to express particular regret that Father Milik's recent book, published by the Cerf publishing house at Paris, has not yet come to hand. Father Milik probably knows more about the Scrolls than any living scholar. The title of his book is: *Dix ans de découvertes dans le desert de Juda* (Paris, Editions du Cerf, 1957).

Moral Theology

CHEMISTS AND THE SALE OF CERTAIN GOODS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. May a Catholic chemist stock and sell the devices known as fertility calculators?

2. What is the position of a traveller for a wholesale firm which markets contraceptives together with many useful and morally unobjectionable lines? May he solicit orders for the contraceptives? If he is asked by a customer, may he receive an order for them?

CHAPLAIN.

REPLY.

1. Fertility calculators may serve good as well as evil purposes. The same is true of many other articles in the chemist's shop—or for that matter in most shops engaged in the business of trading. If the chemist were certain that the purchaser desired to have one of these articles to put it to an unlawful use, *per se*, he would be bound in charity to refuse to sell it. It is practically impossible for him to be sure on the point; and he is justified in presuming that the intentions of his customer are lawful, unless he has positive proof to the contrary. Neither is he obliged to ask embarrassing questions to dispel a doubt, but may act on the principle that we must not judge evil of our neighbour without reasonable evidence.

The calculators referred to are designed to simplify the method of knowing the days of fertility and infertility during the course of the female cycle. That there are such days may be accepted as a fact, but the difficulty is to determine them with accuracy in a particular case. The process is more complicated if, for some reason, the cycle is irregular; and it has never been claimed that anything more than a high degree of probability can be deduced even from the most careful observations and calculations. To what extent the 'fertility calculators' serve to eliminate errors in the computation we do not know, but would be surprised if they were more than a mechanical means to help those who are weak at arithmetic.

The workings of the human organisms are among the mysteries of nature, which we may lawfully endeavour to fathom. A mechanical device which helps in arriving at conclusions that could be otherwise reached by counting days following or preceding certain natural phenomena cannot be condemned outright as an instrument which

serves an immoral purpose, even if the result aimed at is a determination of the days of fertility or infertility. The acquisition of such knowledge is in itself an indifferent act, and would take its morality from the circumstances surrounding it, and specially the end in view. For practical purposes, we may divide those who seek this knowledge into three classes. There are some who are anxious that their marriage be blessed with children; and for them the desire to know the days of fertility is laudable. The next class takes in those who have good reason—on medical, eugenic, economic and social grounds[1]—to exempt them from the obligation inherent in the married state to achieve the primary purpose of marriage. By mutual consent, they have restricted the use of their conjugal rights to the times of infertility, and do not abuse the intimacies of their married life. No one could seriously hold that the use of a calculator is unlawful in their case, since it merely helps them to be more sure of the days on which they may exercise their rights without what is for them an undesirable consequence—the conception of a child. Finally, there are those people who have no valid reason for avoiding the responsibilities of parenthood. Restriction of conjugal relations to the periods of infertility is sinful for them.[2] The gravity of the sin involved is somewhat open to discussion, but it cannot be shown to be a serious transgression of the moral law.

The query concerns a Catholic chemist—whether he may stock and sell fertility calculators. While observing, in passing, that the matter under discussion is governed by the natural law which binds all men equally, whatever be their religious beliefs, we may deduce that the chemist may conscientiously stock what his customers may lawfully request him to supply. It may or may not be true that some of them would have no justification to use these instruments; but, as already remarked, it is impossible for the vendor to know this, and he can charitably presume their legitimate intentions. To sell them to unmarried people who desire to escape the natural consequences of their sin would be another matter; but it would surely be too much of a burden to expect the chemist to enquire about the marital status of his customers.

2. Contraceptives are matters of a totally different class. They serve and can serve no good purpose, and so their sale is forbidden by

---

[1]Discourse of Pope Pius XII. to the Italian Association of Catholic Midwives, 29th Oct., 1951. *A.A.S.* 43 (1951), p. 846. Cf. *A.C.R.*, October, 1955, p. 335.

[2]*A.A.S.* 43 (1951), p. 845.

the moral law. It does not seem possible to justify the salesman who directly promotes the distribution of these detestable articles. His action of necessity shows approval of the perversion of God's plan for the propagation of the human race by the use of the sexual faculty in a manner not *aptus ad generandum*. He should not, therefore, solicit orders for contraceptives. If he is asked to take an order for them, and grave consequences would follow from his refusal, he may possibly be excused on the ground that his co-operation is merely material, in so far as he does no more than act as an unwilling agent for his employer by carrying a message which will be used by others as a means of sin.

* * * *

COMMUNION OUTSIDE MASS DURING THE AFTERNOON.

Dear Rev. Sir,

We have been informed that His Eminence, Cardinal Ottaviani of the Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office has declared that Holy Communion may not be distributed in the evening except during the celebration of Mass or immediately before or immediately after. Does this mean that the liberty allowed under Can. 867 no longer obtains? Before the recent decrees concerning the Evening Masses and the Eucharistic Fast, Génicot interpreted as a 'reasonable cause' for Holy Communion in the afternoon the fact that one had been unable to communicate earlier and had been fasting from midnight. (Génicot II. 187. Ed. 1927). If a man intended to go to Holy Communion at the noon Mass, but accidentally broke his fast at say 11.45 a.m., may he be given Holy Communion at 2.45 p.m., if he has fasted for three hours?

PASTOR.

REPLY.

According to Can. 867, par. 4, to which our correspondent refers Holy Communion may be distributed only at the hours during which the Sacrifice of the Mass may be offered, unless there is a reasonable cause to give It at other times. Mass should not commence earlier than an hour before dawn or later than an hour after mid-day (Can. 821, par. 1), and so these are the hours during which Communion should be given. When Mass is allowed at other times, as on midnight at Christmas, Communion may also be distributed at the Mass. The normal time for receiving Communion is during Mass, as It is a participation in the Sacrificial Banquet. Some vestige of the ancient custom of Communion at Mass, which is founded on the relation between the Sacrifice and the Sacrament, may be seen in the law

restricting the distribution of the Eucharist to the hours for the celebration of Mass. It is, however, a law which admits of exceptions. The Holy Viaticum may be administered at any hour of the day or night (Can. 857, par. 5), and a reasonable cause will be sufficient to distribute Communion on other occasions outside the hours laid down for Mass. Génicot in the section referred to in the query gives by way of example a person who had fasted from midnight and was unable to receive Communion during the morning. It would be a rigorous interpretation of the law to deny him Communion after he had gone to the inconvenience of fasting so long. Cappello[3] would permit Communion after the usual hours not only because of physical or moral impossibility of receiving It earlier but for any cause of some moment: a journey greater convenience or more devotion. Further, the cause could affect either the communicant or the priest. Of course, the excusing cause would have to be much greater in proportion as the interval between the time of actual distribution of Communion and the hours of Mass became longer. To give Holy Communion at six o'clock in the evening or shortly after midnight would require a more serious reason than to distribute It at two o'clock in the afternoon or at five on a winter morning. St. Alphonsus[4] was of opinion that only in case of necessity should the faithful receive Communion at night; but in view of the wording of Can. 867, par. 4, nothing more than a reasonable cause is demanded at any time outside the regular hours for Mass.

The Constitution *Christus Dominus*[5] empowered the Ordinaries to permit Mass during the evening hours on certain days, and stated that at these Masses the faithful could receive Holy Communion. The accompanying Instruction of the Holy Office[6] explained that they could freely go to Communion during the evening Mass and also immediately before or immediately after the Mass. It was generally accepted that the prescriptions of Can. 867, par. 4, remained in full force, and that some excusing cause must be verified to receive Communion except during the period that runs from an hour before dawn to an hour after mid-day, or on the occasion of an evening Mass. The Motu proprio *Sacram Communionem*[7] re-ordered the whole question of the Eucharistic fast and the celebration of Masses later than the hour allowed by the Code; and there was some question as to whether the hour for the

[3]De Sacramentis (Ed. 4a), Vol. 1, n. 373.
[4]Theologia Moralis. Lib. VI., n. 252.
[5]*A.A.S.* 45 (1953), p. 22.
[6]Ibid., p. 50.
[7]*A.A.S.* 49 (1957), pp. 177-178.

celebration of Mass and consequently for the distribution of Communion did not extend from the hour before dawn to midnight. In an article contributed to the Review, 'Studi Cattolici',[8] Cardinal Ottaviani, Pro-Secretary of the S. Congregation of the Holy Office explained that Can. 821, par. 1, has not been abrogated. The celebration of Mass in the afternoon requires the permission of the local Ordinary for the benefit of a notable part of the faithful and the afternoon is not the time *de iure* for Mass. Consequently, the permission for Communion after the time for 'morning Mass" is restricted to what was granted in the Constitution *Christus Dominus,* i.e., during the Mass and immediately before or after it. The spirit of the concessions, the Cardinal explains, is to promote the attendance of the people at Mass, and this purpose would be frustrated if Communion were to be distributed at any hour to whoever asked for it. Though the article from the pen of Cardinal Ottaviani is not an authentic declaration of the law, we must admit that His Eminence is well qualified to know the mind of the Holy See and his interpretation can be accepted without hesitation.

Since Can. 867, par. 4, still remains in force, a reasonable cause will justify a priest who wishes to give Communion during the afternoon apart from Mass. Some special circumstance would be needed, perhaps more serious than when a fast from midnight was obligatory. The fact that a man had fasted till the afternoon hours in order to receive Communion was already a good argument that he had a reason for wishing to communicate on that particular day. With only a three hours' fast from solids and one hour from liquids, he has not suffered such inconvenience to attain his desire. However, individual cases which merit consideration can still arise. Should there be a considerable number who have manifested their wish to go to Communion in the afternoon, the correct procedure would be to place the matter before the Bishop with a request to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice *in bonum spirituale notabilis partis fidelium.*

To reply to the case submitted. The man who accidentally broke his fast at 11.45 and was disappointed that he could not communicate at the mid-day Mass, could be given Communion at 2.45 p.m. His desire to receive the Blessed Eucharist that day and the fact that he was unable to do so because of an unfortunate oversight would constitute a *causa rationabilis* mentioned in the canon referred to. What our correspondent calls the 'liberty allowed under Can. 867' has not been

[8]Estratto dalla Rivista "Studi Cattolici," June, 1957, p. 7. This article has appeared, translated into English, in the Australian Catholic Papers.

taken away. The only difference would seem to be that one big motive for departing from the normal rule—the fact that the communicant had been fasting from midnight for the purpose of being allowed to go to Communion—is absent. This could still be made up for by other considerations.

ADDENDA:

Besides the question regarding Communion during the afternoon apart from Mass, two other matters were dealt with in the article of Cardinal Ottaviani. As they are of a practical nature, we note them here.

1. Should a caramel (or sweet) which is dissolved in the mouth before being swallowed be considered as liquid? The answer is 'No.' It should be liquid before being introduced into the mouth. It would seem that the criterion to be adopted in distinguishing liquids and solids is not whether they are swallowed as one or the other, but what form they have before entering the mouth. By the same rule, ice blocks and ice cream, which dissolve in the mouth, are forbidden for three hours before Communion. Of course, if these frozen foods are allowed to melt before being consumed, they may be drunk up to one hour before Communion.

2. Can the celebrant use wine for the ablutions at the first Mass, when he is to celebrate the second after the period of not less than three hours? Answer: Since the two things are compatible, the priest who celebrates a second Mass not less than three hours after the first, not only may but should take the ablutions in both water and wine, according to the prescriptions of the rubrics.

According to what was laid down in the Constitution *Christus Dominus,* the fast from all alcohol began at midnight, and so the priest who was to celebrate a second Mass would break the fast by taking wine at the ablutions. He was allowed to take both ablutions in water, which does not break the Eucharistic fast in any circumstances. The present legislation provides for a fast of three hours from alcohol before Mass. If the interval between the Masses is less than three hours, the ablutions must not be taken in wine, but water may be used. If the next Mass is not to commence till after three hours have elapsed, there is no reason why the rubrics which prescribe the use of wine for the ablutions should not be observed.

DISTRACTIONS AT PRAYER.

Dear Rev. Sir,

(a) Would a priest who commenced his Office with the best of intentions but yielded to distractions during the greater part of it, fulfil the obligation imposed in the reception of Major Orders? (b) What is to be said of the value of any prayers recited mechanically while the mind is occupied by thoughts of other things?

SACERDOS.

REPLY.

(a) Presuming the distractions are purely internal, the priest who yielded to them while reciting the divine Office has fulfilled the obligation imposed by the Church. Since the distractions were voluntary, if not at first, at least after he had yielded to them, he is guilty of a moral fault. His prayer on behalf of the Church was defective, but remained a true prayer.

(b) If it were possible to recite a formula of prayer in a purely mechanical fashion, it would no longer be a prayer; but it would seem that as long as sufficient attention survives to enable the person to recite the words accurately, he continues to pray, though in a negligent manner which detracts from the value of his prayer, without destroying it entirely.

The reasons which underlie these statements will, it is hoped, become clear as we proceed.

Prayer is an act of the virtue of religion. It is one of the means at our disposal for union with God during our earthly pilgrimage. Hence it is spoken of by the Fathers of the Church as a raising of the mind to God, or a conversation and speaking with God.[9] The strict notion of prayer, however, includes petition: it is a union with God to request from Him what we stand in need of. St. John Damascene defines it in what has become a classical phrase: *Petitio decentium a Deo*;[10] and St. Thomas as a manifestation of our will to God that He may grant its fulfilment.[11] It is an act of the practical reason, that is, it proceeds from the intellect, which endeavours to bring about a desired

[9]St. John Damascene (De Fide, l. 3, c. 24, MG. 94, 1090). St. Gregory of Nyssa (Oratio I de oratione domin. MG. 44, 1125). St. John Chrysostom (in Gen. hom. 30, n. 5, MG. 53, 280).

[10]De fide, l.c. MG. 94, 1090.

[11]S.T. III, q. 21, art. 1. c. Oratio est quaedem explicatio propriae voluntatis apud Deum, ut eam impleat. From this definition, which sums up his teaching in 2-2, q. 83, the Angelic Doctor proceeds to show how it was fitting for Christ to pray, not as God, but in His human nature.

result by disposing the Supreme Cause graciously to grant it. The will also plays its part both in the desire for the object and in prompting recourse to prayer as a means to obtain what is sought.

While prayer necessarily comes from the internal faculties of the intellect and the will, it is difficult for it to be purely internal, on account of the unity of our nature. A person engaged in mental prayer will inevitably portray his interior sentiments by the reverence of his external attitude. It is evident that prayer cannot be merely external, as an act of any kind which does not have its origin in the rational faculties is not a human act at all, and consequently is of no value to render to God the worship due to Him by man. It would seem preferable to consider mental prayer in contradistinction to prayer which is vocal, or expressed in words, and not as something which is in no sense externated.

Since it is a human act, prayer demands the attention of the mind and an intention of the will. In other words, we must know we are praying and want to pray. The text books distinguish actual, virtual and habitual intentions, each of which may be explicit or implicit. The object of the explicit intention is sought expressly, as when a priest takes up the breviary and decides to say the Office, while when the intention is only implicit, what we desire is implied in some other act. The priest who vests for Mass has at the time an implicit intention of consecrating, and a devout Catholic has the implicit desire for the Sacrament of Extreme Unction which is the normal preparation for a happy death, the consummation of a Christian life.

An act which does not proceed from the human will, either directly or indirectly, cannot be placed to the credit or the blame of the person whose activity caused it. It is an *actus hominis* not an *actus humanus*. The act of the will is called the intention. It must have been *actual* at some stage, when it was placed with advertence. The cleric who recites the *Aperi, Domine* with understanding of the meaning of the words has an actual intention of reciting the Office. Due to the weakness of the human mind, it is possible that thoughts about other things will come to him, but he continues to recite the psalms and read the lessons. Though his intention is no longer actual, it has not been revoked and under its influence he reads on. This intention is now *virtual,* i.e., it persists in its effect: it is sufficient for a human act; and to demand more for any length of time would be to ask for what is impossible. If the priest were questioned as to what he was doing, he would certainly reply that he was reciting the Breviary.

Despite the preoccupations which may crowd upon him, he has not ceased the work he began. An *habitual* intention is no more than a disposition to perform a certain act. Every priest would have the habitual intention of fulfilling the daily obligation of the Office, but the mere chance recitation of the psalms of one of the Hours would not absolve him from the duty of saying them again as part of his Office.

When we engage in any activity, whether it be of obligation (as reciting the Office) or merely to satisfy our own convenience (taking a walk for recreation), we continue until we decide to change what we are doing for something else. The decision to alter our activity may be explicit or implicit. When the door bell announces a parishioner who wishes to see him, the priest is reluctantly compelled to put off the completion of the Office till the visitor has been satisfied. He deliberately lays down the Breviary and goes to the parlour to interview the caller. The man who went for a walk meets a friend and accompanies him to his house, changing his mind about the manner of recreation for this occasion. In both instances the intention is altered explicitly. It may happen, however, that we implicitly change our intention by commencing some activity which is incompatible with what we were originally engaged on. This is more true of mental occupations than of external works. A student at his desk may find that his mind has wandered from the book in front of him and that he is making plans for the vacation which will come after the examinations. His intention to study gave out when the day-dream took possession of him, even though the change was imperceptible. The reverie may not have been a human act, because not consciously indulged in, but it is evident that he was no longer engaged at study. Serious study and day-dreaming are incompatible and cannot both be enjoyed at the same time. Not every mental effort, however, demands the same application as serious study, and there is a margin within which we can attend to more than one thing at the same time. Many people can read and listen to the radio; others can carry on serious conversation while driving a car; most find it possible to allow their minds to wander somewhat and still pay sufficient attention to matters that do not call for serious concentration. The more accustomed and expert we are at performing a task, the less effort it costs us, and we can be sure nevertheless of what we are doing while paying some heed to other matters.

The question under discussion is: when does our intention to pray cease to have any influence because of distractions? The answer would seem to be: when we can no longer attend to our prayers. When

attention fades, prayer is at an end. But as we have seen, there are various degrees of attention, which are destroyed by distractions of different kinds. Let us enquire what is the effect of distractions on both mental and vocal prayer.

With regard to mental prayer, it is certain that distractions prevent the special union with God, which such prayer is calculated to produce; but we cannot condemn as absolute waste of time the period occupied with distractions which are not voluntary. Merely to maintain consciously an external attitude of prayer rather than turn to other occupations, or fall into a state of semi-consciousness, is an external act of religion which proceeds from the will and demands some watch over one's self. Voluntary distractions at mental prayer would seem to be a turning away from consideration of honouring God; and the external posture of prayer would be preserved merely as a make-believe.

St. Thomas[12] deals with the necessity of attention for prayer, and replies that if we mean that attentive prayer better attains its end, attention is necessary. But if we ask whether prayer without attention can have any effect, we must distinguish three effects which prayer may have. The first of these is supernatural merit, and for this it is not necessary that the attention persevere throughout the whole prayer, provided one began to pray with the right intention which has not been revoked. Next, is the special effect of prayer, which is to ask what we need from God; and here again it is the first intention with which we began our prayer that God regards above all. But if we ask about the present effect of prayer in our souls, the spiritual refreshment of our minds, prayer without attention is useless. Continued attention at prayer, then, is required for its perfection, and for the spiritual consolations to be found therein, but not for its essence, as a source of merit or a means of impetration. For these, the intellectual acts which gave rise to the prayer continue to have their effect as long as the external act of prayer remains uninterrupted. The Angelic Doctor mentions the three kinds of attention one can have in vocal prayer: a) to attend to the words that they are said correctly, b) to mind the meaning of the words, and c) to pay heed to the purpose of prayer; God Whom we honour, or the favour we hope to obtain. This last is the most important (*maxime necessaria*), and can be achieved even by the uneducated. The more intense it is, the greater is our union with God to the extent that the mind will be oblivious of all else. This is the attention aimed at during the recital of the Rosary by a

[12]S.T. 2-2, q. 83, art. 13.

meditation on the Mysteries of our Redemption. It can also be achieved by those who are incapable of understanding the words of the prayer because of their want of knowledge of the language in which it is recited. The divine Office can be a very fruitful means of prayer for Nuns and others who participate in the prayer of the Church and are very closely united with God, although the precise meaning of the Latin psalms and other portions of the Office may be beyond them.

The minimum attention required for vocal prayer is that which ensures the correct recital of the words; and a priest who says his Breviary with this attention fulfils his obligation. If he follows the sense of the words, he will find it much easier to fix his attention; and the understanding of the meaning of the Office will help to raise his thoughts to God, and thus pray with the greatest benefit. The priest who takes his Breviary with the intention of doing what is prescribed and recites what is printed for the Office of the day, has fulfilled the law. More than that is certainly to be desired, but is not exacted by the Church.

Can one recite the Office validly with a distracted mind? External occupations which are incompatible with prayer would prevent the fulfilment of the obligation. Conversing with a companion, listening to the news on the radio, watching an athletic event are examples of actions which could not co-exist with prayer. On the other hand, an occasional glance at the landscape, a walk in a quiet spot, being aware of the general trend of a conversation which is going on within our hearing, would not be inconsistent with attention to our prayer. External distractions can be avoided, but internal distractions are likely to come wherever we may be. They may be involuntary and due to the natural inconstancy of the mind, and as such they do not interfere with the merit and efficacy of the Office. Voluntary distractions which are our own making, or are at least accepted if they have come unbidden, are a moral fault for which we must account. But as long as they do not gain such a hold that we cannot recite the words correctly while we heed them, sufficient attention remains to sustain the act of prayer and preserve the efficacy of the intention with which the Office was begun. We may repeat that the attention required for the prescribed recitation of the Office demands freedom from external distractions and also from such internal distractions as would hinder the correct recital of the words of the Breviary. If this stage of distraction had been reached, we think the priest would find himself looking at the book, seeing nothing that was written there and saying nothing.

He would no longer have even external attention. The realisation that he has allowed distractions to take such a hold of him would probably bring him back to resume his prayers with better effort.

The question of distractions at prayer which is not recited in the name of the Church would seem to be solved by the same principles. It has been urged that there is a difference in that the intention of the Church supplies in public prayer for the defect in the person of her minister, while this does not apply in the case of private prayer. How can a person who is voluntarily distracted have his mind turned towards God? Is not the raising of the mind to God the basis of all prayer? The answer would seem to be that his mind is raised to God sufficiently, though not perfectly. The distracted man is thinking of two things at once—God and the object of his distractions. These latter have not completely taken possession of him while he is able to recite the prayer, and has not explicitly revoked the intention with which he began to pray.

JAMES MADDEN.

Canon Law

DOES BELIEF IN DIVORCE INVALIDATE MARRIAGE.

Canon 1081 of the Code of Canon Law states that marriage is effected by the mutual consent of the parties, lawfully expressed by persons who are eligible in law, and that this consent must be given by the parties themselves. The same canon also defines matrimonial consent as an act of the will whereby each party gives and accepts a *perpetual* and *exclusive* right over the body for the exercise of acts suitable of themselves for the procreation of children.

It clearly follows, therefore—and this is expressly stated in Canon 1013 of the Code of Canon Law—that unity (the *exclusive* right) and indissolubility (the *perpetual* right) are essential properties of marriage. Hence, as Canon 1086 affirms, if one of the parties, or both, would exclude an essential property of marriage by a positive act of the will, the marriage would be invalid; for, since marriage cannot exist without these properties (because they are essential properties), it follows that the intention or will to exclude even one of them must annul the intention or will to contract a true marriage. In particular, therefore—in view of what is to be said in this article—the will or intention to exclude indissolubility and to contract a temporary and dissoluble marriage automatically nullifies the marriage, and this by divine law since an essential property of this divinely-established institution is positively excluded.

These general observations serve by way of a necessary introduction to bring us to the principal point to be discussed in this treatment of the question: Does belief in divorce invalidate marriage? The introduction into the Federal Parliament of Australia of a Matrimonial Bill which in reality provides for the termination of marriage by divorce, and the nature of the discussion which has centred about the proposed legislation, are two factors which have served to emphasize again a widespread and matter-of-fact acceptance of divorce. It is not the object of this article to discuss this proposed legislation as such, but in view of the canonical doctrine set down in the introductory observations of this article this widespread and matter-of-fact acceptance of divorce—as exemplified in the proposed Bill—provides the occasion for a treatment of an interesting and important point in Canon Law, which we shall endeavour to illustrate in the remainder of the article.

Unless the canonical doctrine on the point is properly understood it could conceivably be argued that the belief in and acceptance of divorce by many non-catholics means that Canon Law—as outlined above—finds itself in a position in which it is forced to draw very harsh conclusions about the validity of the marriages of many non-catholics. For if many believe in and accept divorce, does it not mean that they regard marriage as a dissoluble union? And if they regard marriage as a dissoluble union, does it not mean that they are excluding the property of indissolubility which is stated in Canon 1013 to be an essential property of marriage? And if they exclude this essential property of marriage, does that not make their marriages invalid in accordance with the canonical principles set down in our preliminary remarks? And ultimately, therefore, does it not mean that the marriages of a great number of non-catholics must be considered as invalid in Canon Law on account of this belief in divorce and acceptance of the dissolubility of marriage?

At the outset, of course, it can be stated immediately that such a belief in divorce does not of itself invalidate a marriage in Canon Law, even though the form of reasoning set out above may appear to be cogent and convincing. The canonical doctrine concerning this point is set out concisely in two canons of the Code of Canon Law, and they are quoted here. Canon 1084 states: "A simple error concerning the unity, or the indissolubility, or the sacramental dignity of marriage, even if it be the cause of the contract, does not invalidate matrimonial consent." Canon 1086, § 2, states: "But if one of the parties, or both, would exclude, by a positive act of the will, marriage itself, or all right to the conjugal act, or any essential property of marriage, he contracts marriage invalidly." Thus, as far as the matter under consideration is concerned, the combined content of these two canons is that a person contracts a valid marriage in Canon Law even though he may erroneously believe that marriage may be dissolved by divorce, provided he does not transfer the erroneous notion to the consent he is actually giving, thus positively excluding indissolubility from this particular marriage. If a person does positively condition his consent in this way he contracts an invalid marriage, because by a positive and explicit—even if internal—act of his will he has excluded an essential property of marriage, without which a true marriage cannot exist.

It is not difficult to see that such a positive qualification and conditioning of the will in its application to a particular marriage effects the exclusion of the essential property of indissolubility; for example, if a

person expresses his intention by asserting that he does not intend as a permanent union this marriage that he is now contracting. The difficulty consists rather in seeing how a person who believes that marriage is dissoluble by divorce, and who contracts a marriage in that belief although he does not formulate a positive intention to that effect regarding his marriage, can be said to contract a valid marriage. In other words, the difficulty concerns the canonical doctrine of Canon 1084 rather than of Canon 1086. For, it may be argued, does it not seem that such a person's erroneous belief in divorce is equivalent to a practical exclusion of indissolubility, which would be sufficient to constitute an invalid marriage? Or, putting it another way, how can a person be said to contract a valid marriage in Canon Law, when in fact he adheres firmly to an opinion which excludes a property that is essential to a valid matrimonial consent?

In explaining the logic of the canonical principles contained in Canons 1084 and 1086 the starting-point is the principle that, since indissolubility is an essential property of marriage, a person who *intends* to contract a dissoluble marriage is *intending* to contract something that does not exist, and hence does not contract a valid marriage. Therefore, if a person intends simply to contract marriage and accordingly gives his consent to marry without any qualification, he is presumed to intend marriage as it objectively exists, that is, as an indissoluble union, even if he has the erroneous notion that it *could* be dissolved. The true intention prevails over the mere opinion. In this case the person's consent is directed to the marriage contract itself, and in consequence it embraces those qualities which are part of the essence of the contract; just as a person who purchases an object without making any conditions or qualifications actually purchases the object with all its properties, even though he may be ignorant of some of them or even if he has inaccurate and erroneous ideas about one or more of its properties. His prevailing intention is to purchase the object; and in our present case the person's prevailing intention is to contract marriage. The true intention to contract marriage simply—for *intention* it is—prevails over the mere opinion that it *could* be dissolved —for *opinion* it remains and does not affect the consent simply given.

However, to carry the analogy further—even though analogies may be dangerous—if a person about to purchase an object makes the explicit qualification that he intends to do so only if a certain quality is absent, thus positively excluding that quality, the contract would be regarded as invalid if that quality were in fact to be present. So also,

if a person about to contract marriage positively qualifies his consent and intends this marriage only as a dissoluble union, or explicitly asserts that it is only for a certain time, and so on, then the marriage would be invalid. This intention then becomes the primary intention and prevails over the intention simply to marry, that is, to contract marriage as it objectively exists. In this case a substantial constitutive element, namely indissolubility, is positively excluded; in the other case, namely where only the erroneous belief exists, this substantial constitutive element is not positively excluded, and, therefore, it is included when that of which it is an essential element, namely marriage objectively considered, is simply willed.

Finally, it can be added that the canonical doctrine of Canons 1084 and 1086 has a sound psychological basis, since a simple error is something that is in the intellect, while consent is an act of the will which need not be conditioned in accordance with the error in the intellect. Therefore, if the consent is simply given to the marriage as such, indissolubility is not excluded from the consent even if the erroneous idea still exists in the intellect; but if the consent to the marriage is positively qualified in accordance with this erroneous notion, then the property of indissolubility is positively excluded from the consent, and the marriage is invalid on account of this defective matrimonial consent.

Consequently, the principles set down in Canons 1084 and 1086 of the Code of Canon Law make it clear that the marriages even of non-catholics who believe in divorce will be presumed to be valid in Canon Law, and that in order to establish their invalidity on this ground it would have to be proved that at least one of the parties went further and positively excluded indissolubility in giving consent to the particular marriage.

* * * *

QUESTION CONCERNING THE BANNS OF MARRIAGE.

A letter has been submitted by Father X, and the canonical point that he desires to have resolved may be expressed in the following way: When the Banns of marriage are to be published in a parish other than the parish in which the marriage is to take place, should the pastor who is to assist at the marriage apply for a dispensation if he has not received any notification of the fact and outcome of the publication of the banns in the other parish?

Canon 1020, § 1, contains the ruling that the pastor who has the right to assist lawfully at the marriage bears the responsibility for

ascertaining the freedom of the parties to marry. The publication of the banns of marriage is one of the means prescribed by the Code for the purpose of establishing the freedom of the contracting parties. The obligation to announce the banns is a grave obligation which by law must be discharged, even when the priest is morally certain that the two contracting parties are free to marry (cfr. Canon 21). Hence, if the banns are not to be announced it should be either because of the cases envisaged in Canons 1019, 1026 and 1104, or because a dispensation has been requested and granted for a sufficient reason. It is true, of course, that neglect to announce the banns without a dispensation does not of itself affect the validity of the marriage; but it would certainly involve illiceity in a serious matter since there would be culpable failure to discharge a serious obligation.

Canon 1029 states: "If another pastor makes the investigation or publishes the banns, he shall without delay inform the pastor who is to assist at the marriage by an authentic document of the outcome of this investigation or proclamation." And Canon 1030 warns the pastor who is to assist at the marriage not to do so "before he has received all the necessary documents."

Keeping in mind the foregoing enactments of Canon Law which bear directly on our present case, what are we to say to the query of our correspondent? In the first place, we think it is a justifiable assumption that our correspondent means that the marriage cannot be conveniently postponed, and that there is not sufficient time to contact the pastor who has failed to send notification of the fact and outcome of the publication of the banns; since if there was sufficient time to do this—at least by ordinary means—it should be done, especially in view of the serious nature of the obligation involved and its purpose, namely, that it is a means prescribed by the law to ensure ultimately the validity and lawfulness of the marriage. In the supposition that neither of these two possibilities is practicable the pastor who is to assist at the marriage should apply to the Ordinary for a dispensation. The pastor, however, is not dispensed from the obligation mentioned in Canon 1020, § 1; and hence, in applying for the dispensation in this case—and indeed in any case in which a dispensation from banns is requested—he must have moral certainty from other sources of the freedom to marry of the parties.

While it does appear that in fact the situation could be resolved in one or other of the ways now suggested, it might be urged that a situation could occur in which not even the competent Ordinary could

be contacted. In this case we are in agreement with the opinion that would permit the pastor to use *epikeia* and to assist at the marriage, provided, of course, he is morally certain that there is no impediment to the marriage. After all, even in those cases where the Ordinary grants a dispensation from the publication of the banns it is presumed that there is no probable ground for doubt concerning the freedom of the contracting parties. It is possible, too, that a justification for such a method of acting when the Ordinary cannot be contacted may be derived from the ruling of Canon 1045. This canon gives certain powers to the pastor to dispense from impediments when everything is ready for the marriage, and the Ordinary cannot be reached and there is probable danger of grave harm from a postponement. Thus the principle, *Cui licet quod est plus, licet utique quod est minus,* may well find application so that it may be argued that, since the legislator expressly gives a greater and similar power in Canon 1045, he may be assumed to be willing to allow in the same circumstances the lesser power of which we have been speaking.

* * * *

NATURE OF A NEWLY-CREATED PARISH.

Another very brief question has been submitted in which the questioner asks: "When a parish whose priest is irremovable is divided, should the portion cut off be made an irremovable parish?"

In answering this query it will be necessary at the outset to quote Canon 454, § 3, which states: "Irremovable parishes cannot be made removable without the approval of the Holy See; removable parishes can be made irremovable by the Bishop with the consent of the Cathedral Chapter (or Diocesan Consultors), but not by the Vicar Capitular; *newly-created parishes shall be irremovable,* unless the Bishop, having heard the Chapter (or Diocesan Consultors) prudently judges and decrees that, considering the special circumstances of places and persons, it is more expedient to declare them removable."

It is clear from this canon that it is the mind of the legislator that newly-erected parishes should be irremovable; but he does qualify this by declaring that circumstances may suggest otherwise in particular cases or in particular places and conditions. In this latter case the Bishop, having heard his Diocesan Consultors or Cathedral Chapter—as the case may be—is to be the judge. Keeping before our minds this general ruling as set out in Canon 454, the answer to the query of our correspondent is that the newly-made parish should ordinarily be irremovable. However, the reason for this answer is not the reason that

our correspondent appears to have in mind. That is, the newly-created parish would not be irremovable simply and solely because it was "cut off" an already-existing irremovable parish, thus, as it were, obtaining a necessary irremovability by reason of its origin from an irremovable parish; rather, it would be irremovable by virtue of the ruling of Canon 454, which states the mind of the legislator that "newly-created parishes shall be irremovable." In other words, the irremovability of the new parish would derive from the will of the legislator as manifested in Canon 454, and not from the nature of the parish from which it was separated.

However, it must be noted that the wording of Canon 454 does not impose an absolute ruling to this effect. It makes explicit provision for an exception if the Bishop prudently judges that the special circumstances of places and persons render it more expedient to make newly-created parishes removable rather than irremovable. Consequently, from this point of view it could happen that the new parish envisaged in the query of our correspondent might be erected by the Bishop as a removable parish; and the legal justification for such an action would be found in this provision for exceptions that is contained in Canon 454.

Finally, the attention of our correspondent is drawn to Decree 196 of the Fourth Plenary Council of Australia, which states: "Concilium statuit ut novae quae erigantur paroeciae amovibiles sint, nisi in decreto erectionis contrarium dicatur." The import of this decree, therefore, is that newly-erected parishes in the territories subject to the jurisdiction of the Council are to be created as removable parishes, unless the contrary is expressly stated in the decree of erection. This, of course, cannot be said to be contrary to the ruling of Canon 454, since that canon—as has been pointed out—makes express provision for such an exception; and, in any case, this decree of the Plenary Council has been approved by the Holy See in accordance with the prescriptions of Canons 291, § 1, and 304, § 2.

G. C. GALLEN.

Liturgy

THE TABERNACLE.

The Sacred Congregation of Rites has recently published a Decree concerning the position, construction and form of the tabernacle (cfr. above Official Documents, p. 285). For the most part the Decree simply summarizes the previous legislation in the matter, but there are one or two new determinations.

The present Decree has a background in certain tendencies which have appeared in recent years. The first of these is centred around the adoration of our divine Saviour really present in the Blessed Sacrament. The adoration of the Eucharist in its various forms, e.g., Forty Hours' Prayer, Exposition, Benediction, &c., is now an integral part of Catholic worship. 'These devotional practices have contributed greatly to increasing the faith and the supernatural life of the Church on earth, which indeed by this perpetual worship is giving echo to the hymn of praise which the Church triumphant sings everlastingly to God, and the Lamb "that was slain".' (Pius XII, *Mediator Dei,* E.C.T.S., § 141). At the same time, it is true that this devotion to the Eucharist developed principally in the medieval period. The heretical teaching of Berengarius of Tours (1000-1088) was the occasion of a deeper study of the doctrine of Transubstantiation and emphasized the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The earlier centuries most certainly acknowledged these truths, but the defence of the truths marked the beginnings of the devotions with which we are now so familiar. The theological basis of the new development was both solid and reasonable, hence the Church did not hesitate to promote it in her official teaching. This devotion was further strengthened by the Reformers' rejection of the Real Presence and adoration of the Eucharist, manifested in the tabernacle and the sanctuary lamp, because the distinctive mark of every Catholic church. In our own day, we have also witnessed a great renewal in our appreciation of the liturgy and particularly its central act, the Eucharistic Sacrifice. To promote amongst the faithful a greater awareness of active participation in the Sacrifice of the Mass, to convince people that they should not be mute spectators, some have, with misguided zeal, tended to depreciate the value of Eucharistic adoration. They forgot that the *lex orandi* is just as capable of development as is the *lex credendi.* 'It is true that the

Church is a living organism and therefore grows and develops also in her liturgical worship; it is also true that, always saving the integrity of her doctrine, she accommodates herself to the needs and conditions of the times' (*Mediator Dei,* § 63). We must, indeed, preserve a sense of proportion between the various aspects of devotion to the Eucharist, but this is quite different from eliminating one or other of them. The Holy Father made explicit reference to this point in his discourse after the International Congress of Pastoral Liturgy held at Assisi last year. 'Just as we said above: "The Lord is in some way greater than the altar and the sacrifice," so now we might ask: "Is the tabernacle, where dwells the Lord who has come down amongst his people, greater than altar and sacrifice?" The altar is more important than the tabernacle, because on it is offered the Lord's sacrifice. No doubt the tabernacle contains the *Sacramentum permanens,* but it is not an *altare permanens,* for the Lord offers himself in sacrifice only on the altar during the celebration of Holy Mass, not after or outside the Mass. In the tabernacle, on the other hand, he is present as long as the consecrated Species remain, yet he is not making a permanent sacrificial offering. One has a perfect right to distinguish between the offering of the sacrifice of the Mass and the supreme form of worship offered the God-man hidden in the Eucharist.' The Church manifests her awareness of the distinction between the act of sacrifice and the worship of simple adoration by the restrictions which she places on the celebration of Mass *coram Sanctissimo.* But awareness of the unity of the two aspects of the Eucharist is, the Pope adds, 'more important than a realisation of their differences; it is one and the same Lord who is immolated on the altar and honoured in the tabernacle, and who from the tabernacle pours out his blessings. A person thoroughly convinced of this would avoid many difficulties and would be on his guard against exaggerating the significance of one to the detriment of the other...the person of our Lord must hold the central place in worship, for it is his person that unifies the relations of the altar and the tabernacle and gives them their meaning. It is through the sacrifice of the altar, first of all, that the Lord is made present in the Eucharist, and he is in the tabernacle only as a "memorial of his passion and sacrifice".'

This danger of a lessening of esteem for the presence and action of Christ in the tabernacle may easily arise from the removal of the tabernacle from the altar in order to provide for the celebration of Mass facing the people. The present Decree makes explicit provision for the construction of such altars. By its intervention, the Holy See intends

to forestall the doctrinal misunderstandings which might easily arise in the appreciation of the essential unity of altar and tabernacle were the latter to be generally removed to another place in order to allow Mass to be celebrated facing the people.

A third factor underlying the Decree concerns the approach of modern sacred art to the design and ornamentation of the tabernacle. Apparently some recent designs have not been altogether happy.

The Decree states that the prescriptions of the Code of Canon Law (Can. 1268 & 1269), which refer to the tabernacle, must be strictly observed and that Local Ordinaries must carefully attend to their observance. As mentioned at the beginning, the Decree repeats most of these prescriptions, but it may help to recall the points omitted. i. The Blessed Sacrament may normally be reserved only at one altar in a church. However, as a temporary measure it is permissible to reserve it at a second altar, e.g., for the distribution of Communion during the time of Exposition, or of a mission or novena (1268 § 1). ii. The Blessed Sacrament alone may be placed in the tabernacle. The Holy Oils may not be kept there nor the sacred vessels after they have been purified (1269, § 2). iii. For a grave reason the Local Ordinary may allow the Blessed Sacrament to be removed at night to some other safer and becoming place. It must always be placed on a corporal and a lamp must be lighted before it (ibid. § 3). iv. The priest who is responsible for the custody of the Blessed Sacrament has a grave obligation in conscience to ensure that the tabernacle key is kept in a safe place. The Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments laid down explicit rules for the care of the tabernacle key in its Instruction of 26th May, 1938 (ibid. § 4).

The tabernacle must be firmly fixed to the altar. Normally the tabernacle will be placed on the high altar, but in certain circumstances it may be more becoming to reserve the Blessed Sacrament at another altar in the church where It will receive the veneration due to It. This will ordinarily be the case in Cathedral, collegiate and conventual churches in which choral functions take place at the high altar. The same may be true of a sanctuary in which some special object is venerated and in which, therefore, the veneration given by the people to this object would overshadow the supreme worship due to the Blessed Sacrament.

Mass must be regularly celebrated at the altar at which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved. This provision will serve to maintain the

essential unity between the various aspects of devotion to the Eucharist on which the Holy Father has insisted in recent pronouncements as noted above.

In churches where there is only one altar, this cannot be built so that the priest celebrates Mass facing the people. It must be constructed in the usual way, with the tabernacle set at the middle of the altar, and the size and shape of the tabernacle must be in keeping with the dignity of the Blessed Sacrament. One of the problems associated with the celebration of Mass facing the people has been the arrangement of the tabernacle. In some places a second altar for the celebration of Mass facing the people was erected near the entrance to the sanctuary, between the high altar and the congregation, but this seemed contrary to the idea that the altar should be the focal point of the church. To remove the tabernacle to another altar was not always very convenient and, more important, might easily lead to misunderstandings. In his address after the Assisi Congress, the Pope referred to this when he said: 'Specialists will offer various opinions to solve the problem of so placing the tabernacle on the altar as not to impede the celebration of Mass when the priest is facing the congregation; the essential point is to understand that it is the same Lord present on the altar and in the tabernacle.' A third solution proposed was to reduce the size of the tabernacle. In a church with but one altar, there can be no other place for the tabernacle, but to reduce to size of the tabernacle is, as the present Decree observes, unworthy of the honour due to the Blessed Sacrament. Hence the prohibition of constructing the one altar in such a church for the celebration of Mass facing the people.

The tabernacle must be solidly closed on every side, and so secure as to exclude all danger of profanation. It should be burglar-proof and fire-proof. Tabernacles which have these qualities are readily available nowdays. The commentators frequently mention wood and marble as suitable materials, but the Local Ordinary might well insist that a steel safe be also used, if he is not satisfied that the marble or wooden structure is sufficiently strong.

The Decree repeats the rule for the veiling of the tabernacle. While the Sacred Species are reserved in the tabernacle it must be covered with a veil (*conopaeum*). More than one decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites has insisted on the observance of this law, from which neither custom, nor the precious material or the artistic qualities of the tabernacle can excuse. If, however, the tabernacle is so large or so designed

that it is practically impossible to veil it, then authors are generally agreed that the veil need not be used, and many suggest that in such a case a veil in front of the tabernacle is better than nothing. Recently a writer in the *Ephemerides liturgicae* (lxx, p. 259), following Vermeersch, states that a baldachin over the altar or tabernacle may serve as substitute for the tabernacle veil, but the decrees of the Sacred Congregation do not seem to make this distinction. A white veil may be used at all times and a black veil may never be used; it is preferable that the veil should be changed to suit the colour of the office of the day. The material of the veil may be silk, cotton, wool, but transparent materials such as lace or nylon, which are not uncommon, are forbidden (cfr. *Collectio decret.* ed. 2a, Roma 1947, p. 67). The interior of the tabernacle must be gilded or lined with white silk. Curtains hanging inside the doors are not necessary and, apart from their becoming soiled very quickly, they are a hindrance. A corporal, fitted to the shape of the tabernacle, must be placed on the floor.

In addition to the tabernacle veil, another traditional sign of presence of the Blessed Sacrament is the lamp which must burn continually before It. The use of a coloured glass in the lamp is tolerated, but a white or clear glass is more correct. Olive oil or wax should be used for the lamp but the Local Ordinary may allow the use of other oils, if possible vegetable oils (can. 1271). There seems to be a tendency to abandon rather too easily the very distinct preference which the Church's legislation shows for vegetable rather than mineral oil. The fact that a kerosene lamp does not require the daily attention needed by an oil lamp is hardly sufficient reason for its use. During the War years, the Sacred Congregation of Rites relaxed this law and permitted even the use of an electric light for the sanctuary lamp if oil was unobtainable. A subsequent decree (18th August, 1949) extended the previous indult, but concluded by exhorting Local Ordinaries 'to restore the venerable and age-old tradition as soon as possible.' Are we so poverty-strickened that we cannot provide the proper type of sanctuary lamp in our churches?

In regard to the design of the tabernacle, the Decree states that it should suit the style of the altar and the church. It should not be too different from the tabernacles which have been in use up to now; it should not be reduced to the appearance of a simple box, but in some manner represent the dwelling of God with men. These provisions are

simple and straightforward. The altar is not merely a base for the tabernacle since 'the altar is more important than the tabernacle, because on it is offered the Lord's sacrifice,' at the same time, it is the dwelling place of God and must not be reduced to insignificant proportions. The law requiring the veiling of the entire tabernacle will be a determining factor in its design. It is not permissible to have a permanent throne for Exposition on top of the tabernacle (*S.R.C.* 4268, iv). An earlier decree (4136, ii) had stated that a large cross might be placed on top of the tabernacle, but Webb (*Liturgical Altar,* 2nd edit., 1949, p. 55) says of this decree that it 'cannot mean standing its base upon a flat-topped tabernacle, since this would make it impossible for the *conopaeum* to envelop the entire tabernacle, a rubric from which the *S.R.C.* decrees permit no departure'; O'Connell agrees with this interpretation (*Church Building,* p. 203, n. 2). If, perchance, the tabernacle has a flat top on which the cross stands, it is forbidden to remove the cross and place the monstrance in the same position; the same throne may not be used alternately for cross and monstrance (*S.R.C.* 3576, iii).

Speaking of the ornamentation of the tabernacle, the Decree says that it should not be adorned with unusual symbols or figures which would excite undue wonder in the faithful or be wrongly interpreted by them. Symbols having no relation to the Blessed Eucharist should be excluded. 'The tabernacle itself should be of excellent workmanship, ...but it is impractical to ornament it unduly since it must be *fully covered* by its conopaeum, which is its chief ornament, strictly prescribed by liturgical law' (O'Connell, l.c., p. 170-171). Apropos of the choice of ornaments, some writers are strongly opposed to the use of realistic representations on vestments or altar linens of the chalice and Host, or either of them alone, or of the monstrance containing the Host. They insist that it is incongruous to have such a realistic figure on a tabernacle veil, for instance, when the Reality Itself is contained within the tabernacle. This observation is not without its merits.

The concluding paragraphs of the Decree deal with the reproduction of certain styles of tabernacles which were erected in past centuries and which stood quite apart from the altar. It is strictly forbidden to place the tabernacle outside the altar, e.g., in the wall, or at the side, or behind the altar. The reproduction of tabernacles built in the style of sacrament-houses or ornate towers is forbidden. Only a custom of

a hundred years or more may be tolerated against the prescriptions of the present Decree concerning the mode of reserving the Blessed Sacrament and the form of the tabernacle.

P. L. MURPHY.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

ST. FRANCIS DE SALES IN HIS LETTERS (London: Sands & Co., 1954. 222 pp. 9/6d Stg.).

This is the second edition of a book that was first published in English in 1933 with an Introduction by Abbot Butler, O.S.B. That long but interesting introduction is included in this new edition. Abbot Butler's pages are a good guide to this collection of Letters.

St. Francis de Sales found time in his busy life to write over two thousand letters. A large proportion of them were of course written to St. Jane Frances de Chantal, his special friend and co-Founder of the Visitation Order. His other correspondents were Superiors of various Orders of religious women, and members of their communities. Then there were other ladies, many of them high-born ladies of the world. The sanctity and human interests of the saint were equal to his epistolary gifts.

In this collection his letters to nuns are particularly helpful to anyone trying to walk in God's sight and be perfect. Yet in the matter of striving for perfection his keen gifts of psychological insight lead him to advise a road of commonsense to his correspondents. He writes to one: "Be not so keenly on the watch as to whether you are in perfection or not." He gives two good reasons, adding: "It reminds one of those soldiers who have so many tournaments and sham fights among themselves in training for battle, that when the actual fight comes they are already worn out." The letters of St. Francis de Sales abound in such appropriate imagery, yet they are never over-loaded. Happy the souls who had his wise and fatherly guidance: and happy are we to have his voice in these letters speaking to us across the centuries.

M.O.

Homiletics

THE HIGHEST IDEAL OF SELF-DENIAL AND PATIENCE.

We come at last to the conclusion of the great paraenetic section of Romans (XII, 1-XV, 13) which is a most precious code of Christian thought and behaviour. Practically the whole substance of the Gospel morality and spirituality is to be found in it.

The conclusion occupies only 13 verses of chapter XV, from which the Apostle passes to the personal remarks and personal greetings which bring the Epistle to such an end as agreeably corresponds to the special regard for the church of Rome manifested at the beginning (I, 8-15). The greetings furnish us with a list of St. Paul's friends, which we love to apply to zealous Catholic Actionists of our own day: Phoebe of Cenchrae, and the grand couple Aquila and Priscilla, Epaenetus the "Beloved," first fruits of Asia for Christ, Andronicus and Junias distinguished for apostolic work, the hard-working Maria, Ampliatus, probably a slave but entitled: "Beloved," Urbanus a helper, and Stachys also a "Beloved," Apelles an approved Christian, the households of Aristobulus and Narcissus, Herodion a kinsman of the Apostle, Tryphaena and Tryphosa, Persis the "Beloved" a splendid worker, Rufus probably the son of Simon of Cyrene, Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes, Philologus and Julia, Nereus and his sister, Olympias, and (to finish) all the saints who are the companions of these.

That list is full of interest for us. Many of the names seem to be names of humble people, but the list is a great roll of honour. It was Phoebe who carried the Epistle and therewith "the future of our theology of divine grace" to Rome—the others are among the élite of the imperial city who greatly benefited by the section of the Epistle which we are just about to examine. That we may understand it, as they did, should be our desire. Ten of our thirteen verses (4-13) are the Epistle for the second Sunday of Advent.

We are so used to seeking three points, that we are delighted to meet a pericope which seems to divide naturally into three pieces. It is so with our present passage. There are three groups of thought all centred in Christ, and marked off with sufficient definiteness, as units within a unified block. The first ends with a Scripture citation, the

second ends in a prayer, and the third ends in a prayer. Let us take them one by one.

"We the strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not *please* ourselves. Let each one of us *please* his neighbour, towards the attainment of good, in view of edification. For Christ did not *please* himself, but as it is written:

'The insults of those who insulted thee have fallen upon me'."

We know from previous sections who "the strong" are. They are Christians of firm and sound conscience who know the law of liberty and the exigencies of charity. St. Paul uses the enallage of "we" instead of "you," for such union of association is a most effective method of exhortation. He does not say: "We might be so kind as to bear the infirmities of the weak." He says: We *ought* to do so. It is our duty. I have underlined the verb "please," which occurs three times. We ought not to *please* ourselves. This is a programme which purges out the worst leaven of our lives, the bad leaven of selfishness. Not to please oneself is thorough evangelical self-denial. Pleasing His heavenly Father was the programme of our Lord's life: "At all times I do what is *pleasing* to him" (Jn. 8:29); and the Evangelist St. John, who records this word of Jesus, makes this same study of God's good pleasure the programme of all Christians: "We keep his commandments and do what is *pleasing* in his sight (I Jn. 3:22). St. Paul likewise tells the Colossians "to live a life worthy of the Lord *pleasing* him in every way" (1:10). While the Apostle is careful not to please men in an unfaithful way ("If I were still trying to please men, I would not be Christ's servant," Gal. 1:10), he knows that the twofold love of God and neighbour means pleasing one's neighbour also. It is not, of course, indulgent laissez-aller behaviour towards a weak neighbour, but *strong* condescension to his weakness for his good, to build him up spiritually. As St. Chrysostom points out, this is only making return to God of His gifts. Whoever is strong is strong through the Lord, and he is paying due tribute for this benefit by nursing and helping the weak—always for their good, to help build them up.

The example of Christ is offered for imitation. There never was such a life of complete surrender of the good things of the world and of the comfort of pleasing self. It is not to the *kenosis* or emptying of himself in the Incarnation that St. Paul appeals here, as in writing to the Philippians (2:7), but to the humiliations of the Passion in its widest sense; and (a bit to the surprise perhaps of those who do not consider sufficiently the values of O.T. Scriptures) he quotes a Psalm (68:10),

which told how Christ was to be despised and insultel by those who in their lives despised and insulted His Father.

By an association of ideas, it seems, St. Paul now passes to the consolation of the Scriptures, their power to strengthen the patience, endurance and hope of Christian life. Here begins the Epistle of the second Sunday of Advent:

"For whatever things have been written beforehand, have been written for our instruction, that through patience and the consolation afforded by the Scriptures we may have hope. May, then, the God, who gives patience and imparts consolation, grant you to have amongst you the same unity of mind, according to Jesus Christ, so that, one in spirit, you may concordantly, with one mouth, glorify the God and Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ."

It is a favourite theme of St. Paul that every inspired Scripture of the Old Testament was written for the instruction of the "Israel of God." He had already shown the Romans throughout this long letter what use he himself could make of those ancient writings. Who would have thought that there was so much in the single sentence of Habacuc, "The just man lives by faith"? What a boon it was to be reminded by a pupil of Gamaliel, now an inspired Apostle, that what was written of Abraham and of his faith, which was the foundation of his justice, was written also in view of us, for to us faith is set to account, "if we believe in him, who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered up on account of our sins and rose again for our justification". Here Genesis and Isaias simultaneously pour the treasures of their instruction into the mind of the teacher of the gentiles (Gen. 15:6, and Is., 53:4).

He had already told the Corinthians, when recalling facts from the history of Israel in the wilderness, that "all these things are examples set to teach us" (10:6), and that everything happened to that Hebrew generation "typally," being written for our warning, for upon us the final era of the world's history has come" (10:10, 11).

Later he was to tell Timothy that the Scriptures which he read in his Greek Septuagint, could "instruct him for salvation through the faith which is in Christ Jesus. For every Scripture inspired by God is useful for teaching, for reproving, for correcting, for instructing in holiness, that the man of God may be perfect, fully equipped for every good work" (Tim., 3:15-17).

When the Apostle tells the Romans that our hope goes on and grows through patience and the consolation of the Scriptures, we are

reminded of an event in the history of the Machabees. When Jonathan, the successor of Judas Machabeus, sent legations to Rome and to Sparta carrying letters drafted in similar wording, we are informed that the letter to the Spartans contained these phrases: [We seek to renew the alliance made between us and the Spartans in the days of Onias and your Spartan ruler Areios]. "Really we have no need, seeing that we have for consolation the Holy Books which are in our hands. Nevertheless, we wish this renewal of fraternity and friendship" (I Mach., 12:6-10). Scripture has God for its Author, and God is the Father of mercies, the God of all consolation. Actually there is no book that shows the action of God so constantly and consistently in the world, His providence extending from end to end. "This is my consolation in my affliction," says the Psalmist, "for thy word gives me life" (118:50). "Thy word," said Jeremias, "was my delight and the joy of my heart" (15:16). The Bible is a book which, when eaten, becomes honey in the mouth (Cfr Ezechiel 3:3).

Those who love the Sacred Boks greatly know by experience how true this is. St. Jerome, in his Prologue to a commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, addressed to his disciples, Paula and Eustochium, writes: "If there is anything, Paula and Eustochium, that keeps one right and wise in this life, and amidst the afflictions and storms of the world persuades him to remain tranquil, I am sure that it is, above all, the meditation and knowledge of the Scriptures" (P.L. 26, 439).

What St. Paul wished most of all from the spirit of patience and consolation amongst the Christians of Rome was that God should grant them great unity of heart. The book of the Acts of the Apostles shows the perfection with which this unity of spirit was realized in the infant church at Jerusalem: "The multitude of the believers had only one heart and one soul (4: 32). Love which is "according to Christ" is a purified love. It is free from the dross of selfishness. Selfishness is separative, charity is unitive. This chorus of unanimity giving glory to God is not only a monastic but simply a Christian ideal: "that you may with one mind (homothumadon) and with one mouth glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

"See," says St. Chrysostom, "how he does not say merely with one mouth, but bids us do it with one will also. See how he unites the whole body into one, and how he concludes his address again with a doxology, whereby he gives the utmost inducement to unanimity and concord" (Hom. XXVII in Rom.).

In the Rome of the year 58, although we have no reason to believe

that there was a spirit of division at work, such as produced parties in the Corinthian community, friction between Judeo-Christians and ethnico-Christians must have sometimes made itself felt. S. Augustine, in the Preface to his Exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians, considers the difference between the Roman situation and that of the Churches of Galatia. In Galatia the Judaistic danger was real and very threatening; in Rome there was no such danger, but there was in fact or, at least, in possibility, a difference of appreciation between Christians from Judaism and Christians from Paganism. The Jews were always inclined to think that the grace of Christ came to them as a reward due to the works of the law, while the gentiles could consider the Jews very undeserving, for the Jewish people rejected and murdered their Messias. The gentiles would consequently consider themselves to be in a better position. In the following passage the Apostle sets the matter in its true light, invoking the Scriptures abundantly: The Jews have to honour the fidelity of God to His promises; the gentiles should honour His mercy towards them; and both should rejoice together and with great unanimity in the hope of the Gospel promises. The text is as follows:

"Therefore receive each other with a cordial welcome, as Christ received you, for the glory of God. For I tell you that Christ Jesus has been a minister of the circumcised, to show God's fidelity in realizing the promises made to the Fathers, while the gentiles glorify him because of his mercy, as it is written:

'For this I will praise thee amongst the *gentiles,* and will sing hymns to thy name' (Ps. 17:50).

And again the Scripture says:

'Rejoice, ye *gentiles,* together with his people' (Dt. 32:43).

And again:

'Praise the Lord, all ye *gentiles,* and let all peoples sing his praises' (Ps. 116:1).

And again Isaias says:

'There shall be the root of Jesse, and he who arises to rule the *gentiles,* in him the *gentiles* shall hope.'

Now may God, the giver of hope, fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that you may abound in hope and in the power of the Holy Spirit."

If the Epistle to the Romans were written in our day, we should be inclined to say that St. Paul looked up the word "nations" or "gentiles" in a concordance, and chose four texts which suited his thesis.

It has been conjectured that, although concordances did not then exist, there were collections of "Testimonia," such as we know in the third Christian century. The conjecture is not necessary here, for St. Paul knew his Bible, and, in any case, the passages from the Law, the Prophets and the Writings are drawn from very well-known places: two Psalms, one of which belonged to the Minor Hallel which was so much used in Jewish thanksgivings, one from the great Deuteronomic Canticle of Moses, and the fourth from the first great Messianic cycle of Isaias, the Book of Emmanuel.

The Apostle's lesson is meant chiefly for the gentiles. They were in the majority in the Roman community, and we may feel sure that intolerance was more likely to arise amongst them. St. Paul is very discreet in his method of bringing them to a mood of indulgence. He uses not the weight of his authority, but the weight of scriptural texts. These same texts would also humble the Jew, for they show very abundantly God's concern for the gentiles.

The prayer, with which the pericope ends, is fundamentally a prayer for unity, for joy wells out of unity, peace is in unity, the common aspiration of hope makes unity, and the first source of unity is the unifying power of the Holy Spirit.

It will be good to ask St. John Chrysostom to homilize this for us. In Homily XXVII he speaks as follows:

"The Apostle means that you must get rid of listlessness towards one another, and that you must not be cast down by temptations. This will be by your abounding in hope. Such abundance is the cause of all good things, and it comes from the Holy Spirit. But it is not solely from the Spirit but from our contributing our part also. Faith is its foundation. Indeed, this is the way for you to be filled with joy—to believe, to hope. He demands not hope only, but an abundance of hope, so as to be able to find comfort in troubles, but much more than that, so as to be able to find joy through the abundance of faith and hope. In this way you will draw the Spirit to you, and you will continually cling to all good things. Just as food maintains life, and life rules the body, so the living activity of good works shows that we have the Spirit, and if we have the Spirit, we shall have good works. On the other hand, if good works are absent, the Spirit flies away. The departure of the Spirit opens the door for the coming of the unclean spirit, as happened in the case of Saul. If we are in such peril as that, we have need of the harp of David, that he may charm us with the divine songs. We must not fight against those songs by our actions, and offer hostility to the

charmer of our actions, as Saul did of old. With the psalms, therefore, let us sing those other psalms of good deeds, that we may cast out sin, which is worse than any demon."

These are the thoughts (freely translated) which the Pauline phrases: "abounding in hope and the power of the Holy Spirit," suggested to the Prince of Sacred Orators. St. Chrysostom then goes off into a magnificent description of the charms and riches of the Psalms, in which we cannot follow him now. Our Patron of preaching shows us that in the homily we can talk on a bit, if the vein opens before us. This is really one great advantage of the homily, for the homily is, as its name says, a familiar discourse.

W. LEONARD.

Notes

PORTRAITURE — OR GROSS DISTORTION?

In his book, *Two Portraits of St. Teresa of Lisieux,* Fr. Etienne Robo sketches with heavy-handed irony what he calls the popular edifying portrait of the saint, and then proceeds to draw, with the cold 'objectivity' of the historian, what he is pleased to call the realistic portrait. The work is one in which misunderstanding of the saint reaches monumental proportions, and it would perhaps be wiser to ignore it completely. However, some readers could be taken in by what purports to be a plain unvarnished tale, and fail to pay due heed to the teaching and example of her whom Pope Pius XI described as "God's living word to His Church." Consequently it will not be amiss to indicate some of the grave deficiencies, historical and theological, of a work that could do much harm.

The author regards his work as the fruit of calm historical research, lying as a golden mean between the extremes of romantic naturalism on the one hand and uncritical devotion on the other. He writes: "My book is neither a blind panegyric nor a work of devotion. It is merely a re-statement of the story of St. Teresa made in the detached, objective, and impartial spirit of an historian. This will perhaps contrast strongly with the romantic presentation of novelists, such as *La petite Thérèse* of M. van der Meersch, or the purely edifying ones of uncritical writers... In matters theological I let myself be guided by the authority of the Church, while in matters of history and of common experience I am the servant of the evidence before me." Fr. Robo has failed to notice that when the historian is writing about a canonised saint, he must in matters of history take account of the authority of the Church, for canonization is an infallible statement regarding a matter of historical fact, viz., that the person concerned has practised Christian virtue in an heroic degree.

The avowed aim of the book is to reduce the stature of the saint from the heroic to something much nearer normal holiness. We read: "To place a saint too much above human conditions, and beyond our imitation by artificial praise does not help us, does not encourage us. We love more, because we come closer to, a saint who like ourselves is only a poor human being, a compound of darkness and light, yet showing us that, common clay as we are, we can rise to God and have some share in His Divinity." From this it would appear that the author's aim is not so much history as edification. We need help and encourage-

ment; so the saint must be portrayed as a poor human being like ourselves. This is a hazardous undertaking, for the last four Popes have praised the saint for a life immeasurably superior to that of the generality of the faithful. Fr. Robo nowhere shows any sign of being acquainted with their utterances. The faithful, too, have been helped and encouraged by the thought that God has raised one so like themselves so far above them. But Fr. Robo has a low opinion of their judgment in this matter. He writes: "Generally speaking, Catholics are but dimly acquainted with her story, and amongst her most enthusiastic devotees, not more than five per cent. have attempted to read a few pages of her autobiography, while not one in a hundred has read it carefully from cover to cover." This statistical estimate is obviously no more than a piece of wild speculation. Not quite the thing one expects from a person writing in "the detached, objective, and impartial spirit of an historian."

Fr. Robo grossly exaggerates the elements of darkness in St. Teresa's soul, and finds moral evil where there is none. He might be fairly described as a self-appointed Devil's Advocate, at work about fifty years too late. It is evident that he has been deeply influenced in his estimate of the saint by *La petite Sainte Thérèse,* which he describes as "a brilliant and extremely successful novel by a well-known writer, M. van der Meersch." This novel, a great *financial* success, purports to be the true history of the saint, and is in fact a purely naturalistic interpretation of her sanctity. Fr. Robo refers to it frequently in his book, which is not much more than a re-hash of van der Meersch, with the fictional guise removed. The Abbé Combes assembled a team of writers who were, in Fr. Robo's phrase, "to confute, pulverize and annihilate" van der Meersch's novel. They were justly indignant at the travesty of Christian holiness presented by van der Meersch, and they achieved their object. When they had finished with the novelist, he was indeed confuted, pulverized and annihilated. Fr. Robo describes them as "exasperated apologists" and sharply criticises the vigour of their controversial methods.

If one is to understand a saint, or for that matter any human being, the first requisite is sympathy. Fr. Robo seems to lack this elementary qualification for his task, for all the evidence points to the presence in the author of a sharp natural antipathy towards the saint. Like all mystics, the saint is an introvert—what the psychologist Sheldon calls a 'cerebrotonic' personality, extremely sensitive, and preoccupied with the world of thought and feeling, a personality which extroverts find

incomprehensible. Fr. Robo has no sympathy with mysticism, and from various remarks one would gather that he is what Sheldon would call a 'somatotonic' personality, or muscular extrovert. Temperamentally incapable of understanding the saint, he describes her as "neurotic" or a "neuropath," when the facts only warrant the judgment that she was sensitive and highly-strung.

The author's antipathy towards the saint comes out in countless places. She says that she was not spoiled by her father. Fr. Robo knows better. If she dispenses with a prayerbook when assisting at Mass, he criticises her for "thinking herself under a divine inspiration which places her above ordinary rules." He criticises her because, at the age of sixteen, she did not always act "with the deliberation of a grown-up woman." She is "injudicious," "imprudent," "indiscreet." He accuses her of misleading the Prioress in 1896, the year before she died. "Must we blame the Prioress," he asks, "or Teresa for evasiveness, and almost for misrepresentation?" There can be little doubt that in his mind Teresa is the guilty party.

The things that caused the saint pain would not have caused Fr. Robo much pain. So when he speaks of her sufferings, he puts the word in inverted commas.

In entering the convent, she "runs away from the world"—not the most friendly way of putting it. If she speaks of Christ in the language of Holy Scripture as her Divine Bridegroom, she is rebuked as "romantic," and if she expresses her love for Him in ardent terms, she is "unbearably emotional"; if she quotes the Canticle, he is scandalized—"such things are somewhat unexpected from a nun's pen."

Fr. Robo is so anxious to find fault with the saint, that in some instances he contradicts himself. Thus he explains on p. 83 that she deliberately kept her sisters at a distance, to avoid the danger of forming a block of opposition that would have undermined the superior's authority. Then on p. 94 he blames her because she deliberately refrains from having any private conversation with her sister Pauline. "It seems to us," he declares sententiously, "that Teresa's zeal outran her discretion."

When discussing the temptations against faith to which the saint was subject in her last years, he labels them "doubts." Since a doubt against faith is sinful, this makes the picture blacker than it should be. His description of this trial is amazingly shallow and unperceptive, for he regards the temptations as simply a symptom of mental weakness, as obsessions. Had he read and understood St. John of the Cross, he

would have known that such things are by no means abnormal, being simply the reaction of human reason to an exceptional infusion of supernatural light. Fr. Robo cannot see how such trials are compatible with a consciousness of close union with God. He writes: "During the last weeks of her life, it is evident that Teresa was in a state of mind exactly the reverse of what one expects from someone who proclaims herself to be a saint." He could hardly have written this, had he reflected on the darkness Our Saviour experienced on the Cross.

Fr. Robo has no sympathy with mysticism, with such things as "the obscure and ardent poetry of St. John of the Cross." He much prefers the prose of St. Francis de Sales, "a genius so eminently French in his practical, clear and logical spirituality," whose *Treatise on the Love of God,* according to Fr. Robo, is "untouched by emotional raptures." It looks as if his reading of the Treatise has stopped short of Books VI and VII, for in these St. Francis expresses himself in language no less ardent than that which St. John of the Cross employs.

Not surprisingly, Fr. Robo's lack of sympathy with mysticism is allied with a failure to comprehend the place of Christian charity in Christian holiness. He has not understood that charity is a special virtue, and he reduces the love of God to obedience and sacrifice; for him the keeping of the first commandment is the prosaic observance of the others. When the Saint speaks of mystical graces, he is sceptical, for he regards her as possessing a very emotional temperament, as "hopelessly and incurably romantic," and there is no place for emotion in his cold, matter-of-fact conception of holiness. For him the only thing that counts is a "love of reason and will"; emotional love is "only an experience," like an earthquake, and "has little to do with will, choice, or reason." For S. Thomas, emotion plays a much more important role in the moral life of man than Fr. Robo would assign to it.

Criticised for her emotionalism and sentimentalism, the saint is then found to be far too cold and rational in her love for others: "It seems to us that although she protests she loved 'her little lambs' and would have laid down her life for them, this impersonal love of hers, as clear as a winter sun, and as cold, sometimes repelled the novices more than it comforted them." Fr. Robo would like to have found her "entirely satisfied with a love of reason and will," and then is critical when he meets what looks like an instance of it.

Fr. Robo's work is pervaded by a spirit which one can only describe as rationalistic. For him, as for van der Meersch, the secret of S. Teresa's holiness is her "immense will-power," "the unswerving power

of her own will." He summarily dismisses her mother's experience of having her future husband pointed out to her as "an auditive hallucination." When the saint has a vision of Our Lady, he is ready with a categorical explanation: "The religious mind of the child created the heavenly picture which alone could bring her comfort and recovery." Her intuition of future glory is for Fr. Robo not supernatural, but simply "an impulse that comes from the depth of her subconscious," even as her deathbed prophecy of posthumous fame could, in his view, "be more properly described as an intelligent anticipation of her sister's aims and exertions on her behalf." In this he is consistent, for he is suspicious of intuition and tends to equate the certain with the reasonable. He writes: "The value of our certainties does not depend on their intensity, but on the good reasons we can show for them." How would the faith of the unlearned fare, when measured by this yardstick?

The saint tells us that when she was a child she thought about God, the brevity of life, and eternity. Fr. Robo's comment on this can only be described as fatuous: "This is not normal in a healthy child." As if the saints are to be judged by the standards that apply to normal human beings! Similarly, he is critical of her desire to enter Carmel at the age of fifteen: "There appeared to be no special reason why this exceptional step should be taken." She had made it a rule not to speak of her illness. Fr. Robo asks: "Was it prudent?" When she foretells her own canonization, he is scandalized: "This is, we believe, a unique instance of a saint proclaiming their own sanctity, and announcing their own canonization, and we do not pretend to hold the key to this problem." The saint is not unique. Fr. Robo has forgotten the Magnificat: "Behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. Because he that is mighty hath done great things to me, and holy is his name."

Fr. Robo speaks in disparaging terms of the Way of Spiritual Childhood, which the saint first walked in, and then taught to others. He calls it "a childhood-complex" and offers a rationalistic explanation of its origin: "We should remember that at home she had been 'the baby' of a large family and as such, spoilt by M. Martin, who was really a born grandfather. Perhaps on account of her breakdown and of her extreme sensitiveness she occupied a privileged position in the home and was spared everything in the nature of housework. She was very obedient to Pauline, but remained always, for them all the youngest, the baby. Under the hard discipline of Carmel, it is natural that Teresa's thoughts would turn to those early days when at every step she was lovingly taken care of and saved from responsibilities. She longed to be

a child again; she still thought of herself as one, and dreamt of Jesus as treating her as one."

What Fr. Robo regards as a natural phenomenon, to be explained in terms of psychiatry, Pope Pius XI has affirmed to be the work of grace. "God has seen fit," the Pope declared, "to offer to this proud age an outstanding and imitable example in His faithful and beloved servant, Thérèse of the Child Jesus, and by means of her, to remind us of the solemn and well-known precept of Uncreated Wisdom: 'Unless you be converted and become as little children, you shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.' It is in this precisely that the character of the sanctity to which God called Thérèse properly consists; a sanctity which was faithfully realized in herself and in all her actions, and of which she was a living exemplar...The new Saint Thérèse was penetrated with the Gospel teaching and put it into practice in her daily life. Yet more, this Way of Spiritual Childhood she taught by her words and example to the novices in her convent, and she has revealed it to all by her writings, which have been spread all over the world..." Fr. Robo takes the view that the saint's influence has been much more restricted than the Pope would have us believe. "It is doubtful, he writes, whether in the World outside convents, the Little Way has,—under that designation—received the attention and popularity Teresa had desired and expected."

For those Catholics who, following the lead of Pope Pius XI, have declared themselves disciples of St. Teresa of Lisieux, Fr. Robo has a lable. They are "Theresians"—a sect or coterie, it would seem, within the Church. Biographers who have portrayed her in brighter colours than the sombre ones employed by Fr. Robo are written off as "panegyrists" or even "blind panegyrists," and their books as historically worthless, because "written for the sole purpose of edifying the reader." Their admiration for the saint is based on misunderstandings, Fr. Robo's on reality. Others, with the best intentions, have distorted her features; Fr. Robo, at long last, has discovered the truth for which the world has been waiting half a century—that the saint was a neuropath, and guilty, even in her last years on earth, of notable moral faults.

We ask ourselves why Fr. Robo is at such pains to minimize the holiness of the saint of Lisieux. Is it fanciful to find a clue to this mystery in his dedication of the book? This reads: "The the memory of my sister Mary Louise, an Ursuline nun, who died of tuberculosis at the age of 26 in the convent of Hennebont in Brittany in 1904." St. Teresa, it will be remembered, died at the age of 24 of tuberculosis, in a

convent in Normandy in 1897. The parallelism is remarkable, and as we reflect on it, we can hardly fail to be struck by the contrast between the impact of the canonized saint on history and the obscurity in which Fr. Robo's sister, presumably a holy religious, lived and died. And this brings us to the question: Why was Teresa of Lisieux canonized? Fr. Robo provides his answer in fifteen pages of clever innuendo (pp. 158-173), in which he portrays the Saint as a person of no more than ordinary holiness, unconsciously co-operating in the grand design of Mother Agnes, her sister Pauline. Pauline had made up her mind that Teresa was a saint, and already during her lifetime she hoped for her canonization. During her last illness, Teresa "now weak and helpless, depended more than ever on her masterful, obstinate, clever, Pauline." Her conduct was not above reproach, for when her sisters tried to cheer her up, "their efforts were not always well received." On another occasion, she "answered almost petulantly." When her sanctity was questioned by the community on the grounds that she had had an easy time and had never suffered, she "seems for once to have been put out by this untrue report." When she was asked whether she was afraid of God's judgments, she "took refuge in her favourite phantasy: she was still a little baby. 'For little children,' she said, 'there is no eternal punishment!'" Finally, as we have seen, her temptations against faith are, for Fr. Robo, hardly consistent with a consciousness of extraordinary holiness. How then did she come to regard herself as a saint and predict her canonization? According to Fr. Robo, the idea that Teresa was a saint worthy of canonization originated with Pauline. Pauline communicated her conviction to the community, and to Teresa herself. He writes: "Teresa, in the infirmary, was most of the time surrounded by her three sisters, who took it for granted that she was a saint, and their conversation implied it day after day. Teresa could not fail to be responsive to this atmosphere, and in all simplicity of mind, unfettered by any inhibitions, she expressed herself in the same words as they did...Alone much of the time with her three sisters, she slides into their ways of thinking and speaking." As her conviction of her own sanctity is simply an echo of Pauline's, so her prophecy of her future glory "could be more properly described as an intelligent anticipation of her sister's aims and exertions on her behalf," for we must "remember that Teresa knew her sister for the clear-headed, determined woman that she was, and for a good organizer as well."

For Fr. Robo, then, the glorification of St. Teresa of Lisieux is to be ascribed not so much to the Holy Ghost as to her sister Pauline.

Pauline made up her mind that her sister was a saint. When she was Prioress, she instructed Teresa to write the story of her life—"a very unusual request to make to a young nun, only twenty-one years old"—and during the saint's last illness she begged Mother de Gonzague, again a Prioress, to order Teresa to complete the task. She convinced the saint of her own sanctity, of the importance of the Autobiography, and of her future canonization. She touched up the Autobiography, had it published, and saw the cause of canonization through to a successful conclusion. Fr. Robo nowhere mentions the miracles worked through the saint's intercession. It would have been rather difficult to put those down to the organizing genius of Mother Pauline.

To refute Fr. Robo's argument there is no need of lengthy argument. *Securus iudicat orbis terrarum.* The Church is not so gullible as Fr. Robo would lead us to believe. The faithful know heroic sanctity when they see it, and their judgment has been confirmed by the seal of miracles and the solemn pronouncements of the Vicar of Christ. It is a great pity that Fr. Robo's book ever saw the light of day, for piety and historical truth are both done a disservice when the saints are reduced to the level of ordinary mortals. Doubtless some of the author's observations are just, but the over-all picture he gives us of the saint is no portrait, but a grotesque caricature, and his performance, as he attempts to analyse the interior of her whom St. Pius X called "the greatest saint of modern times" resembles nothing so much as the wild plunging of a bull in a china shop.

G. H. DUGGAN, S.M.

* * * *

PORT-ROYAL

It is curious how well Sainte-Beuve's *Port-Royal* has stood the test of more than a century; more curious still at first sight was his choice of subject, in Balzac's angry opinion the most boring subject that Sainte-Beuve could inflict on the patient Swiss. Last year de Montherlant's play, *Port-Royal,* created something of a furore on the Parisian stage. Of course, neither Sainte Beuve nor Montherlant had religious aims in their work; it was the dramatic and piquant defiance of a handful of nuns which has so strongly appealed to them and to so many others besides. *Port-Royal* remains a great and fascinating name. This obscure, ancient convent entered a period of excitement on July 5, 1602, when it received a new abbess in the person of Jacqueline

Arnauld, in religion Mère Angélique. Madame de Port-Royal was ten and a half years old; she had not yet made her first communion. It was evident that the spirit of the Council of Trent had not yet reached Port-Royal des Champs even after forty years. Her father was a prominent advocate at the bar of Paris, and the father of twenty children, of whom ten were living, nearly all of them having inherited his pugnacious and intelligent qualities. Our own age is prosaic enough, but the practical mind of the people of the 17th century takes one's breath away. This Christian father placed two of his daughters in convents in almost their years of infancy. However, he saw to it that both Mère Angélique and Mère Agnès were made abbess in their respective convents. Port-Royal went on in its quiet way, while its young abbess played in the garden when it was fine, and read Roman history and 'good' novels when it was wet. And history was nearly the ruin (from a Jansenist point of view) of Madame de Port-Royal. She determined to leave; her father, who had brow-beaten juries up and down the country, made quick work of her Pelagian (as she called it later) nonsense and sent her back to Port-Royal. The convent was a convenient summer home for the Arnaulds, as the enclosure was not strictly enforced. But she was not an Arnauld for nothing. In 1608, long before she had ever heard the names of Cornelius Jansenius and Saint-Cyran, during a sermon delivered by a visiting Capuchin, "God," she wrote, "touched me so that I felt happier as a nun..." A year later the young abbess, she was about 18, decided to reform her monastery. The nuns had to give up their private apartments, their silver dishes, and the enclosure was to be enforced. The testing time for the last point came on September 25, 1609. It is one of the great days in the history of Port-Royal, ever remembered by its historians and dramatized superbly by Sainte-Beuve, the *journée du guichet.* M. Arnauld's heavy carriage was heard. He was refused admittance. The great advocate used his voice of Stentor to no avail; in the end he had to get into his carriage with his family and drive back to Paris. From 1609 to 1625 the admirable work begun by Mme. de Port-Royal, guided by such excellent advisers as St. Francis de Sales and the pious bishop of Langres, Zamet prospered. How characteristic of the 17th century it is to find a bishop of a vast diocese accepting the position of spiritual director in a convent far distant from his diocese. The first cloud appeared in the Port-Royal sky with the debates concerning the *Chapelet Secret,* a series of sixteen meditations in honour of the sixteen centuries that had passed since the institution of the Eucharist A competent modern reader of

the *Chapelet* (which had been written by Mère Agnés) is of opinion that the quasi-condemnation was unwarranted from a doctrinal viewpoint, even if the meditations in certain cases were vague and, perhaps, unsuited to the nuns. In his distress, the Bishop of Langres turned for help to a priest whom Richelieu had described as "the most learned priest in France," Saint-Cyran. Thus it was by chance, so to speak, that the friend of Jansenius made his entrance into Port-Royal. He was Mme. de Port-Royal's destiny. Whether she ever understood the Bishop of Ypres's theology may be questioned; the rigorism of Saint-Cyran won, however, her life-long support. The heresy of Port-Royal was one rather of the infallibility of the Church. The nuns, pure as angels, proud as devils, as the famous description has it, persisted in the views of Saint-Cyran, who called to his aid in his letter *Tempus tacendi, Tempus loquendi,* Mme. de Port-Royal's brother, the unfortunate Antoine Arnauld, the great Arnauld. It was he who in his book *On Frequent Communion* brought doctrinal Jansenism down to practice, notably the absention from communion for motives of devotion. Mme. de Port-Royal came to regard herself as a public sinner, unworthy of communion, because as she confessed openly she had borrowed money for the purpose of building! The Jansenists, it is tragic to say, attracted an elite. The gentle and scholarly Tillemont, whose historical work was so plundered by Edward Gibbon, the grave de Saci, the extraordinary educator, Nicole, are but a few of great souls attracted to the severity of Port-Royal in that elegant century. The above names fade before the religious genius of Pascal and the literary glory of Racine, who was the pride and sorrow of Port-Royal. Port-Royal, with a courage that was worthy of a better cause, stood firm when the five propositions of Jansenius were condemned; it endured even the fierce attacks of Pascal on its enemies in the *Provincial Letters,* which were so unchristian in tone that Mère Angélique herself begged Pascal to stay his murderous pen. Mère Angélique died in sentiments of great peace, although until shortly before her death she saw herself, as she said, before God as a criminal at the foot of the scaffold. Her dying wish was that the sisters should live in peace. Canon L. Cristiani in his recent book *L'Hérésie de Port-Royal* stresses the strange nature of Jansenism as a heresy that involved seemingly saintly people, because Mère Angélique had qualities that mark her as an extraordinary person.

In 1664, Hardouin de Péréfixe, Archbishop of Paris, by order of Louis XIV, sought the submission of the 80 nuns at Port-Royal. The nuns after their interrogation wrote down an account of the Arch-

bishop's actions and words, not forgetting his outbursts of anger: Taisez-vous (Shut up!); you are a fool and full of pride. The nuns asserted the rights of conscientious objectors. It is this famous scene that H. de Montherlant has lately dramatized.

Louis XIV was not a man to brook interference with his plans. At the very end of his reign, with papal approval, he determined to scatter the proud nuns and to destroy the very convent buildings. It was just one hundred years since the *journée du Guichet* (1609-1709), when police officials and royal archers came to execute the royal orders. With dignity, the nuns submitted and *manu militari* were scattered to convents in distant parts of the country. The distressing business of the destruction of the buildings followed, which Sainte-Beuve described so pathetically. Over a thousand bodies of the great ones in the Jansenist heresy had to be removed. Then Port-Royal was a dreadful solitude. *Finis venit, venit finis.*

T. VEECH.

Book Reviews

ECCLESIASTICAL PROPERTY IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND, by Rev. James E. Munday, J.C.L., Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C., 1957.

It is with very great pleasure that this particular Dissertation is taken up for review. The Canon Law Studies published each year from the School of Law at Washington constitute a very important source of information on matters canonical. *Ecclesiastical Property in Australia and New Zealand,* the result of the author's study and research, presents an historical synopsis and comparative study of the general law of the Church as contained in canons 1495 to 1551, of the Code of Canon Law, and decrees 653 to 685, of the Fourth Plenary Council of Australia and New Zealand.

As many a harassed Bishop and impecunious Parish Priest know only too well material cares and financial worries stifle and distress the spiritual shepherd as he goes about the care of souls. The religious Superior also knows the heartaches and material frustrations involved in the spiritual works of mercy. The material cannot be separated from the spiritual, the temporal from the eternal. Whether those in authority, as Ordinary, Pastor, Administrator or Superior, like it or not, the Church, at least under one aspect, represents a vast business organization and carries with it the need for prudent management and careful administration.

Even St. Paul, despite his burning zeal, was not exempt from the nagging cares of administration. On one occasion he despatched Titus to collect the offerings which the faithful in Achaia had contributed to the needy brethren in Jerusalem. However, together with Titus two companions were sent. The Apostle explained:

> They (the Churches) were anxious that no suspicion should be aroused against us, with these great sums to handle; it is not only in the Lord's sight, but in the sight of men that we have to study our behaviour. II Cor. VIII, 20, 21.

Again, greed, cupidity and dishonesty must be guarded against; the deaths of Ananias and his wife Sapphira stand as a stark and ominous warning of the difficulties and tragedies that can arise, even in the Church itself, when the question of temporalities is raised. In later times St. Cyprian speaks of Nicostratus as having defrauded widows and orphans as well as having robbed the Church.

The simple administration of the primitive and early Church soon proved inadequate as her wealth and patrimony increased: administration and management became more detailed and complex. As her resources and wealth increased men grew envious. The Church's fundamental right to acquire and possess property was attacked. In England the statutes of mortmain deprived the Church of the right to inherit and alienate property. Later the Tudors were to wrest with violent hands

ecclesiastical treasures and lands. Against all such attacks the Church has always vindicated her inalienable rights with regard to property.

Of necessity the Dissertation under review, because of its extensive terms of reference, does not delve deeply into this aspect of the historical background. The introductory chapter gives a brief synopsis of the history of the Catholic Church in this country and examines the application of the common law of England in Australia with regard to Church property. In the second and main part of the work, *the Canonical and Decretal Commentary,* the second chapter deals with the tenure of ecclesiastical property; the right of the Church to acquire and possess property is vindicated and a study is made of the different forms of tenure, property held in fee simple, or by a body corporate. Special attention is given to tenure by corporation aggregate, required by the Fourth Plenary Council. The author points out that the legislation of the Council is in accordance with the provisions of the *Roman Catholic Church Trust Property Act,* 1936, of N.S.W.

In subsequent chapters methods of acquiring income, administration, alienation, and pious foundations are considered with particular application to local conditions. The section dealing with the alienation of Church property is excellent and should be of very practical assistance to those who are concerned with the conservation and administration of such property. Likewise, the section dealing with prescription gives a brief but informative comparative study of the requirements of Canon Law and civil legislation and will prove useful supplementary reading for the study, in Moral Theology, of that mode of acquiring property.

The author has made a definite contribution to the study of the general law and the particular law of Australia and New Zealand. In addition, he has rendered a service to his successors in the Schools of Canon Law by preparing the way for a detailed study of particular questions which were outside the scope of this work.

T.J.C.

* * * *

IT IS PAUL WHO WRITES, by Ronald Cox, C.M., S.T.L., S.S.L. C.Y.M. Publications, Auckland, N.Z. 1956.

This book is a sequel to the author's most useful and deservedly popular *Gospel Story.* It will be welcomed by Catholic youth Organizations, for which it is chiefly intended, by busy professional men, by the multitudes who desire easy access to the very difficult writings which came from the stupendous mind and the apostolic heart of St. Paul. As a great lover of St. Paul, John Chrysostom said: "The heart of Paul was the heart of Christ." The reading and meditation of his letters is (after the Gospels) the most solid and nutritious food with which the Christian soul can nourish itself. The table is spread in this book. A reviewer of it ought to be a herald who goes out on the streets and says: "Venite, comedite: Come and eat."

In some ways this book is better than the *Gospel Story*; in some

ways (we shall be pardoned for saying so) it is inferior. The lay-out of both books is the same—a left-hand page containing the sacred text in the version of the late Monsignor Knox, a right hand page offering a commentary, section by section. The sacred text of the present book is the whole text of the Acts of the Apostles with the Epistles in their historical place, including the Pastorals which are posterior to the biennium of St. Paul's Roman imprisonment with which St. Luke closes the Acts. "For reasons of convenience rather than conviction" the author has placed the Epistle to the Hebrews also within the historical frame of the Acts. Let us accept this with a murmur, and merely as a convenient fiction.

The superiority of the book over the *Gospel Story* is, we think, in the superiority of the translation. The Gospels were not Mgr. Knox's best work, but his version of the Epistles, as a clarification of St. Paul's thought in easily intelligible and often very powerful English, was a godsend to those who despaired of studying the Epistles in their Rheims-Challoner New Testament. The inferiority of the volume before us seems to be in the commentary-page. The Gospels lend themselves more easily to a running explanation; the Pauline Epistles do not so easily lend themselves to this running treatment. Candidly, the right-hand page of this book is often not exegesis. A theologian will find it hard to condone, unless he remembers constantly that the author's intention is to present thoughts that lead off in some way from the text of the Acts and of the Epistles—good thoughts often attached only by a free and loose exegetical bond. I would be rather severe on this feature, only I happen to know that well educated Catholics have been pleased with it.

A reviewer might also raise a quarrel about the chronology, but it would hardly be fair to the purpose of the book.

A better title for the book would be, perhaps: "Paul Speaks." St. Paul is a writer that is always living—a voice rather than a scribe. One remembers the words of St. Chrysostom: "As I keep hearing the Epistles of the Blessed Paul read—gladly do I enjoy the spiritual trumpet. I get roused and warmed with desire at recognizing the voice so dear to me, and seem to see him all but present and conversing with me."

W.L.

* * * *

TRIDENTINE SEMINARY LEGISLATION: ITS SUCCESS AND ITS FORMATION, by James A. O'Donohoe, J.C.D., Publications Universitaires, Louvain, 1957. Pp. VI + 187.

This interesting and finely documented thesis is of as much interest to the historian as to the canonist. How were the clergy formed and educated before the period of the Council of Trent? This is a question that remains to be answered. A very small percentage studied at the universities, and it is to be assumed that many of these lost heart after the long years spent in Arts. In 1510-11, 265 priests were

ordained at York (173 being regulars). Where did these men, together with some 500 deacons and subdeacons, obtain their theological education? Sir Thomas More said of the clergy: "I wot well there be therein many lewd and naught. And surely wheresoever there is a multitude it is not without miracle possible to be otherwise. But now if the bishops would once take into priesthood better laymen and fewer (for us be they made) all the matter were more than half amended." The medieval church had been unable to solve this problem (and the Anglican Church after the Reformation had the same problem). The Council of Trent in the 23rd Session introduced the legislation, bringing about the erection of seminaries. The author gives a brief historical study of the education of priests through the centuries, which is an admirable summary, though to say that the School of Alexandria existed at the end of the *first* century is strange.

The author informs us of the work done at the 5th Session of the Council of Trent, when the question of the exposition of the Sacred Scripture was raised, and with the example that the German College, founded by St. Ignatius, gave to those who sought new methods in the education of the future clergy. He then devotes very interesting pages to the seminary legislation of Cardinal Pole while he was legate under Queen Mary, contending that Pole's legislation deeply influenced the later Tridentine decree. Both Pole's text and that of Trent are printed in parallel columns which shows strikingly the degree of dependence. The author can find "no documentary evidence to substantiate" the view "that Pole's seminary legislation was composed under the influence of the founder of the Jesuits." The objectivity of this book is to be noted, together with the evidence of extensive reading on this always important question. There is a useful index.

T.V.

* * * *

LIFE IN CHRIST. Religious Doctrine for Secondary Schools. In Three Parts. Fergal McGrath, S.J. M. H. Gill & Son Ltd., Dublin. 1957.

In these manuals of Christian Doctrine Fr. McGrath takes the life of Grace as a unifying theme, and gives the following titles to the three parts of his work: I. Life Given and Lost, Life Won Back (the Creed); II. The Rules of Life (the Commandments); III. The Sources of Life (Prayer and the Sacraments). The scheme is a good one. Knowledge of the life of Grace is necessary to grasp the whole economy of salvation. Besides, children need some framework on which they can arrange their knowledge, so that the essentials will stand out and the details fall properly into place.

In a canvass so wide as this it is only too easy to carp at selected spots. However, in this picture of Christianity there is one lack which seems to mar the drawing as a whole. Men are united to God, their heavenly Father, and come to share the life of Grace, precisely as members of Christ's Body, which is His Church. This, therefore, is a

doctrine which should occupy a central place in Fr. McGrath's presentation, a teaching which should form the background to the whole picture. Unfortunately, this is not the case. The doctrine, indeed, is mentioned; but it isn't part of the framework, it does not permeate the work as it should. We do not see it standing out in clear relief among the effects of Baptism. Again, there is no mention of the social effects of Holy Communion, no mention that It is the Sacrament of Unity and Peace. Marriage is not presented as being of value to the whole of Christ's Kingdom, because it is a miniature figure of the fruitful union which exists between Christ and the Church. In fact, St. Paul, The Apostle of the Gentiles, does not come into his own at all. In other ways, too, the author loses sight of his main theme, and in the most unexpected places. In the section on the Incarnation, e.g., there are headlines for Jesus Christ as the Way (our model), the Truth (our Teacher), but not as the Life!

The Scriptures, in books such as these, should be present as their very lifeblood, and we have plenteous quotations . It should be noted, however, that some of the great themes from the Old Testament are missing. The high-notes from the Book of Exodus are not sounded, and this lack is felt when the author comes to such matters as Redemption, Sacrifice, New Testament, Baptism, and the Liturgy of Holy Week.

There are many things to praise. In Book One, for example, there is a section devoted to Our Lady. It is good, and unlike so many manuals, gives emphasis to the fact that Mary is the Mother of God, and that in God's plan she has a central part to play in the work of our redemption.

That Christianity is a religion of positive love is an idea that cannot be stressed too much. Here the Ten Commandments are placed in perspective with a good introductory section on the Two Great Commandments, love of God and love of neighbour. With one exception the discussion of the commandments is full and clear. For manuals aimed at the 14-16 age group the treatment of the 6th Commandment, at least for Australian conditions, is not sufficient. If there is no positive teaching on the God-created goodness of sex, it is impossible to hold young people to Christian standards. In the same way the portrayal of marriage is rather jejune. The moral motives put forward by St. Paul—be pure, because you are members of Christ; do not lie or steal, because you are members of one another—could well fit in here. Once again, the background is missing from the picture; and that is a pity. Whilst on this matter of morality, it might be as well to say that to prepare young people to live in this world of ours an apostolic mentality must be cultivated in them. There is no great enthusiasm for it in Fr. McGrath's manuals. He has a note that the laity should spread the faith by prayer and example; but there is more to it than that.

Most teachers of religion when looking into new manuals take a glance at the section on the Holy Mass. Here, too, there is room for much praise. Perhaps one suggestion might be made. It is this: young

people, as well as being led to share interiorly in the Holy Sacrifice, should also be prepared for and encouraged to give that active, intelligent and exterior participation so desired by the Popes of this century.

The manuals have paper backs. Included are some excellent black and white illustrations from the Old Masters—nothing, however, of contemporary efforts. There is an index at the end of Book Three, and it is a good one.

To conclude, the idea of a unifying theme is a good one; but the fear remains that often in these booklets the author loses sight of his theme, fails to develop it in all its richness, and thus does not allow it to permeate, as it should, the whole of his work. His presentation of the good news of Christ's religion is rather sober, and perhaps a little too careful. There is not enough of that vigour and freshness of approach so necessary to make it all a living whole, able to grip the minds and hearts of the youthful members of Christ's Kingdom.

L.C.

* * * *

JESUITS—BIOGRAPHICAL ESSAYS, edited by Robert Nash, S.J., Dublin. M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd. 1956. pp xvi & 230. 12/6.

These nineteen brief biographies of Jesuits, averaging about twelve pages each, embrace the major events in the history of the Society. All are by Jesuits except the work of Dom Ernest Graf, O.S.B., on Archbishop Goodier.

The Introduction by Donald Sullivan, S.J., sets out clearly the intention of the editor and the purpose of the book. It is a twentieth century tribute to St. Ignatius, a tribute aimed at showing the sublimity of his poetic mystical vision and the solidity of his foundation in that his aspiration and work have endured in his spiritual sons of all places and times. The aim of the Society is to serve "Jesus Christ, whom alone they wish to serve." This is what makes all the men in this book "one colour and likeness" despite striking accidental differences of race, speech, and circumstances of upbringing. The aim of the Society is elaborated in aspects of this service:—To serve Christ the King—to conquer the world beginning with self, to strive for the likeness of Jesus in labour and the sacrifice of suffering. To follow the Standard of Christ, choosing poverty rather than riches, contempt rather than honour, and putting on humility in place of pride. To be contemplatives in action, i.e., "to seek and find God in all things" even in their busiest moments.

Was Ignatius' ideal realized? This is the purpose of the present work, to provide the answer to this query: and it is an uncompromising affirmative. The essays take us through every century since the days of Ignatius himself, though fittingly ten of the men treated belong to this twentieth century. Whether we are in Europe with St. Aloysius Gonzaga, Padre Cruz and Father Rupert Mayer: or in India with Father Beda Chang: or in South Africa with Brother Frank de Sadeleer: or in Mexico with Father Michael Pro: or in the U.S.A. with

Father Daniel Lord: no matter where or in what times, we see the spirit of Ignatius and the ideals that were his moving his sons to the tremendous works narrated here.

In places the biographies suffer through the necessary brevity of the essays, developing into mere recitals of events. But deeds speak loudly and the treatment is generally adequate for the purpose of the work. The well produced plate of the statue of St. Ignatius in the Chapel of the Conversion at Loyola is a fitting frontispiece for a tribute made in the four hundredth centenary of the Saint's death.

P.F.M.

* * * *

MISSION ON THE NILE, by James Dempsey. London, 1955. PP. XII + 247, 17 illus., 5 maps. Burns and Oates. 34/-.

Here is a book to take its place with the more notable examples of mission literature. It is quite factual, quite free of the romancing and glamorising often found in literature of this kind. At the same time it is well suited to provide armchair entertainment, coming as it does from the able pen of this English missioner, already the author of four books. Besides, it is commended to our interest by the fact that it concerns one of the missions of the Mill Hill Fathers, a society little known out here, but especially by reason of the current persecution of the Church in Sudan. That persecution is aimed mainly at the Catholic schools of Southern Sudan, and it is the importance of these schools which is brought out in this book, tempore non suspecto, for the schools and dispensaries have up to now been the chief means of contact in the work of converting this backward people.

The first hundred pages are given over to a comprehensive study of the Shilluk people among whom this mission is set. But the intending reader need not be put off by the ominous sound of the word "study," for it is really a most fascinating account. The remainder of the book deals with the mission itself and mission anecdotes—which, of course, needs no further commendation. It is a lively book, liberally supplied with maps and illustrations.

The general impression is of quiet wit in the midst of hardship, and this is well summed up in the final paragraph: "Oh, well! As an American friend of mine, a Presbyterian minister out here, once said to me: 'I guess you haven't got to be crazy to be a mission-airy, but it helps'."

E.D.S.

* * * *

THE INNER SEARCH, by Dom Hubert Van Zeller. Sheed & Ward. London and New York. Price, 15/- Sterling.

LOVE—this is what man craves for with every fibre of his being. If he finds it he is happy; if he does not, then he is miserable. God is love and Jesus Christ is God—here, therefore, is the answer to "the inner search": *Jesus Christ.* "It is when a man discovers Christ," says

Dom Hubert Van Zeller, "that he discovers the Holy Spirit. It is also then that he discovers love and discovers himself." Such is the predominating thought throughout this spiritually stimulating book; each and every aspect of the spiritual life is dealt with in terms of love. This is how it should be, because the spiritual life is really a 'love affair' in which the soul tries with all her power to grow more and more in the love of Christ.

One of the more remote effects of original sin seems to be the extraordinary facility that men have of "mistaking the means for the end. But to love Christ is to surrender oneself to Him completely—love matters pertaining to the spiritual life." The author puts it perfectly where he says: "to develop accidentals of sanctity at the sacrifice of sanctity is one of the most common of spiritual errors." What really counts is the love of Jesus Christ; all else are but means to this sublime end. But to love Christ is to surrender oneself to Him completely—love and sacrifice are inseparable: "Where love has been preached without sacrifice, it has led not to love, but to licence."

Dom Hubert clearly shows the way along the narrow path of sanctity: "in order to find sanctity...we do not have to step out of the mould in which our lives are cast. All we have to do is to surrender ourselves to His (God's) Will." Elsewhere he says: "If the saint is the man who makes God's Will his whole happiness, he can be very happy in a world where he is getting God's Will the whole day long." Then a little further on, he really touches on the heart of the matter when he says: "the whole stuff of sanctity is nothing else than the deepening and extending of 'not my will but Thine be done'."

Dom Hubert writes with much zest and punch; as a result, many of his thoughts penetrate the reader's mind like a strong shaft of light. He really wants his message 'signed, sealed and delivered.' Perhaps his greatest asset is his deep spiritual insight, which evidently springs from a strong and lively faith. He is pre-eminently a sane and balanced writer and always keeps things in their right perspective, not letting the particular point under consideration lose its rightful place in the jealous hierarchy of values—a tendency not always suppressed by spiritual writers.

This book will do much good at a time when the true notion of sanctity is being clouded and misconstrued on all sides. Some imagine that sanctity cannot be separated from miraculous phenomena, extraordinary mortifications, ecstasies, etc.; others feel certain that it can only be attained by beings that lie somewhere between men and the angels—certainly not by ordinary human beings like ourselves. The author says emphatically that it is the saint who is 'the complete man' and that a life of union with Christ "is no distant ideal proposed only to mystics and saints: it is an undertaking projected every time an infant is baptised."

L.B.

General Index

Contents of Vol. XXXIV.

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS.
(Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.)

Affinity, Queries about 103
Biblical Associations, Instructions on 287
Bishop Lyons, Appointment as Coadjutor to Bishop of Sale . 1
Bishop of Sale, Most Rev. R. Ryan, Papal Letter to, on Jubilee of priesthood 193
Catholic Missions, Encyclical .. 185
Collin, Michael, Case of 103
Eucharist, Decree of S.C. of Rites on vigilance 285
Eucharistic Fast, Motu Proprio extending faculties of Christus Dominus 97
Holy Week, Ordinances regarding the Restored Order 98
Holy Week, Simple Rite 102
Maitland, External solemnity of feast of O.L. of Perpetual Succour in Diocese 191
Marriages by Proxy, Circular of S. Cong. of the Sacraments .. 2
Oriental Canon Law, Motu proprio 281
Seminaries, Readmission to 291
Szekely, E., Warning about book 192
Unamuno, M.de, Books condemned 104
Valid Concelebration 284

ARTICLES.

Decorating Church and Chapels: The Priest with the Artist (Rev. John P. Kenny, S.J.) 8
Juridical Relationships between Parish Priests and Clerical Religious, II, III, IV (Rev. Thomas Connolly, D.C.L.) 18, 123, 195
Mary. The Universal Dispenser of Graces, III (Rev. Augustine Regan, C.SS.R.) 29
The Background and Meaning of the Biblical Flood Narrative, I (Rev. William Dalton, S.J.) 292
The Catholic Times (1877-79) and the Express (1880-84): Two Catholic Papers printed in New South Wales, I. II (Robert A. Daly, M.Sc. Agr.) 112, 202
The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Brief Review (Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.) 305
The Divine Virtue of Hope (Right Rev. Mgr. Cornelius Roberts, D.D., Ph.D.) 105
The Nature and Function of Education (Peter J. R. Watson, B.A., F.R.Econ.S.) .. 214

MORAL THEOLOGY.
(Rt. Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D.)

Baptism, Case of lay 232
Baptism, Parish of 236
Chemists and the Sale of certain Goods 313
Communicatio in sacris, Problems of 232
Communion, Frequent 232
Communion outside afternoon Mass 315
Co-operation in unlawful operations 47
Fast, Eucharistic, Afternoon Mass and 141
Fast, Eucharistic, and onerous work of the sacred ministry . 42
Fasting, The laws of 130
Marriage, Approval of forbidden 46
Marriage, Dispensation and danger to morality 44
Marriage, Presence at non-Catholic 236
Marriage, Valid assistance of .. 226
Marriages, Rectification and Sanatio of irregular 229
Mass pro populo on Easter Vigil 231
Prayer, Distractions at 319

CANON LAW.
(Very Rev. Mgr. G. C. Gallen, P.C., D.C.L.).

Jurisdiction for hearing confessions of seriously ill female religious 51

Marriage Case concerning disparity of cult 55
Marriage, Does belief in divorce invalidate 325
Marriage, Question on Banns . 328
Sacred Ordination, The Multiplication of irregularities to 242
Parish, Nature of a newly created 330

LITURGY.
(Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D.).

Coffin in church, Position of ... 149
Communion, Accident in giving to sick person 252
Epistle and Gospel in English, Reading 147
Epistle and Gospel at High Mass, Reading by celebrant 251
Litanies, Repeating invocations 252
Mass, Blessing hall before 150
Mass, Dialogue 253
Mass facing the people 249
Mass, Priest and People at 58
Oratio Imperata 150
Preface, singing of 151
St. Philomena's Cord 149
Tabernacle, The 332

HOMILETICS
(Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.).

Charity between those of strong and weak consciences 255
Charity, The Sum of the Law . 70
Highest ideal of self-denial and patience, The 339
Knowing the Time 153

NOTES.

A modern Historian and Religion (Very Rev. T. Veech) .. 165
Annual Subscription 74
In Memoriam: Jules Lebreton, S.J. (Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.) 74
Delegations to Communist China (Rev. Patrick M. Farrell, O.P.) 79
Port-Royal (Very Rev. T. Veech) 354
Portraiture or Gross Distortion? (Rev. G. H. Duggan, S.M.) . 346
The Eucharist Fast 266
Two Recent Books (Very Rev. T. Veech) 260
The Spiritual Indwelling of St. Thomas (Rev. G. Jackson) .. 159

BOOK REVIEWS.

American Catholicism (Ellis) .. 260
By Courage and Faith (Burton) 172
Cedar of Lebanon, A (Daher) . 273
Clerical Attire (Ganter) 173
Complete Index of the Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas, A (Deferrari and Barry) 181
Confirmation Stories 50
Crown of Mary, The (O'Shea) 17
De La Salle Brothers in Australia, The (Br. Aloysius) .. 170
Devotion to the Sacred Heart (Verheylezoon) 269
Doctor Rabelais (Lewis) 263
Ecclesiastical Property in Australia and New Zealand (Munday) 357
Extraordinary form of marriage according to Canon 1098, *The* (Fus) 168
Fast before Communion, The (Madden) 266
Father of the Little Flower, The 167
First Australian Congress of Religious Brothers 88
Giving to God (Zeller) 111
Hearts Afire (Forrest) 28
Holy Bible, Vol. III, The Catholic Association of America ... 90
Hymns of the Roman Liturgy (Connelly) 275
I am a daughter of the Church (Eugene) 181
In silence before God (Philipon) 122
Individuation (Goldbrunner) .. 169
Inner search, The (Van Zeller) 364
Irish Pilgrimage (Mould) 92
It Is Paul Who Writes (Cox) 358
Jesuits (Edit. Nash) 362
Jesus the Saviour (James) 271
Life in Christ (McGrath) 360
Manual for Interior Souls (Grou) 83
Martyrs in the Canon (Lloyd) 304
Medical Ethics (Healy) 84
Mission on the Nile (Dempsey) 363
More Apostles and Evangelists (Lloyd) 304
More Blessed than Kings (McCorry) 180
Necessity of confession for the sacrament of Penance, The (McKeever) 85
Origen (Danielou) 92
Our Time is now (O'Leary) ... 94
Philosophy To-day 213

Priest in the world, The (Sellmair) 87
Problems in Theology, Vol. I (McCarthy) 268
Rafael Cardinal Merry del Val (Buehrle) 272
Retreat with Our Lady (Polloi) 17
Revolt of Asia, The (Dawson) 241
Sacraments in the Christian Life, The (Philipon) 178
Sacraments on the Missions, The (de Reeper) 267
Saints and their Attributes (Roeder) 95
Saints upon a time (Windham) 248
Saint Bernardette (Petitot) ... 170
St. Francis de Sales in his letters 338
Saint Ignatius' Idea of a Jesuit University (Gauss) 173
St. John Fisher (Reynolds) ... 278
Saint Therese and Her Mission (Combes) 175
Seeds of the Desert (Voillaume) 177
Seal of the Cross, The (Carroll) 276
Superior's Handbook, The 95
Tenders of the Flock (Trese) . 272
They saw His Glory (Ward) .. 171
Thoughts for Daily Living (Sheen) 277
Tridentine Seminary Legislation: Its success and its formation (O'Donohoe) 359
Way it worked out, The (Stern) 254
Way to inner peace (Sheen) .. 179
Wheeling years, The (Sisters of the Good Samaritan) 274

"B.C." Macaroni and Spaghetti

Manufactured from highest grade Semolina.

Note the difference when you serve "BC" brand Macaroni and Spaghetti.

★

"Olio Sasso"

PURE ITALIAN OLIVE OIL

PURITY AND DELICACY UNSURPASSED

●

Olio Sasso is genuine Italian Olive Oil, made from the finest olives, and preferred the world over for use in cooking, in salads, or medicinally.

B. Callose & Sons

Pty. Ltd.

22 CAMPBELL STREET, SYDNEY.

PHONE MA 4630.